

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE TRUE PAULINISM

BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

OF the false idea of Paulinism that marked the German criticism of the later part of the last century it is unnecessary here to speak; of that supposed Paulinism which was contrasted to a supposed Petrinism, although (as Canon Streeter remarks in his *Four Gospels*) it would have been more plausible to find Paul's adversary in James. All this meant forcing the New Testament into the Hegelian mould of thesis, antithesis and synthesis; the root of the matter lay in *a priori* categories and not in the evidence.

The true Paulinism is union with Christ and unity in Christ; as an explicit conception it is gaining ground steadily in the Church, partly as the result of progress in biblical studies, and partly as a secure foundation for that personal devotion to Christ which is always a mark of the Church, but appears to be especially strong at the present time. The study of Holy Writ bears no fairer flower than the Pauline Christology, a simple yet all-embracing synthesis of what Christ is in Himself, of what He is and ought to be in us. It is to this part of Scripture that Catholic scholarship has instinctively turned in the West to search for treasures somewhat neglected in the past, but able to satisfy every quest, because they are in truth the unfathomable riches of Christ Himself. St. Augustine is full of the doctrine of the "Mystical Body," though he does not actually use the term; he presses on to it so quickly and so insistently as even to occasion some difficulty in regard of his teaching the Real Presence. But otherwise this central thought of Paul is not so familiar to the Western Fathers and their successors as to the Eastern Fathers; all that is essential in the doctrine is there, but is not set forth with the same clearness and emphasis, nor does it appear to the same extent to give life and meaning to the whole. Thus a

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE TRUE PAULINISM

BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

OF the false idea of Paulinism that marked the German criticism of the later part of the last century it is unnecessary here to speak; of that supposed Paulinism which was contrasted to a supposed Petrinism, although (as Canon Streeter remarks in his *Four Gospels*) it would have been more plausible to find Paul's adversary in James. All this meant forcing the New Testament into the Hegelian mould of thesis, antithesis and synthesis; the root of the matter lay in *a priori* categories and not in the evidence.

The true Paulinism is union with Christ and unity in Christ; as an explicit conception it is gaining ground steadily in the Church, partly as the result of progress in biblical studies, and partly as a secure foundation for that personal devotion to Christ which is always a mark of the Church, but appears to be especially strong at the present time. The study of Holy Writ bears no fairer flower than the Pauline Christology, a simple yet all-embracing synthesis of what Christ is in Himself, of what He is and ought to be in us. It is to this part of Scripture that Catholic scholarship has instinctively turned in the West to search for treasures somewhat neglected in the past, but able to satisfy every quest, because they are in truth the unfathomable riches of Christ Himself. St. Augustine is full of the doctrine of the "Mystical Body," though he does not actually use the term; he presses on to it so quickly and so insistently as even to occasion some difficulty in regard of his teaching the Real Presence. But otherwise this central thought of Paul is not so familiar to the Western Fathers and their successors as to the Eastern Fathers; all that is essential in the doctrine is there, but is not set forth with the same clearness and emphasis, nor does it appear to the same extent to give life and meaning to the whole. Thus a

revival of Augustinian thought might profitably develop this point of view; but for us it is better still to drink deep draughts at the source.

Christ Our Lord, speaking to those who misconstrued His doctrine and were hounding Him to death, did not cast His pearls before swine; He did not work out to the full, so far as we can judge, the full implications of His teaching. Even towards the end of His ministry the Jews were importuning Him to tell them plainly, not whether He claimed to be God, but whether He claimed to be the Messiah;¹ and they did not attain their desire. Christ veiled His full doctrine to some extent, speaking, for example, in parables; He did not wish either to shock the good or to give a handle to the bad, but He steadily led those forward who showed good will. Only at the Last Supper, where He is alone with the Twelve, may He be said to speak freely of man becoming one with Father and Son, and of the work of the Holy Spirit; and we recognise at once the fundamental identity with the thought of Paul, though with an evident difference in the presentation.

In the Johannine report as in the epistles of Paul, and indeed in the Petrine formula also that we are "partakers of the divine nature," we find up to a certain point the language of identity. Our Lord prays that all the faithful may be "one thing, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they too may be in us . . . that they may be one as we are one: I in them and thou in me: that they may be perfected in unity." The Apostle proclaims that "it is no longer I that live, 'tis Christ liveth in me": "for me to live is Christ." Christ is the Head, whose members we are, limbs of His very body; whose life is ours. For the present I desire to do no more than point out how strong are the expressions which indicate unity and identification. In those brought up in the strict Jewish monotheism, or for whom a monotheism no less strict belonged to the very foundations of their whole faith, pantheism was not a danger. Secure upon that side, without need to guard against the vague monism of our own time, St. Paul, like Christ before him, was only concerned to bring out the intimate union of the believer with the God-man. He was in fact as much

¹ John x. 24.

and more concerned to press home this unity as Luther was to sever it; it is truly a paradox that Luther should have been thought to bring men nearer to Christ, when his doctrine of imputation (as against imparted grace) set up between Christ and the Christian a chasm that could not be crossed!

The Catholic doctrine, on the other hand, contained both fact and ideal; to a varying extent this unity was a fact in every Christian, but it could always become so to an ever greater extent. According as the soul yields to His sweet wooing, the Saviour can take possession of the whole man more and more, working upon him through His Church from without, while penetrating and permeating him more and more from within. His action is thus theandric, as were His actions in His human life. With His human voice He commanded the cure, the calm of the sea, the devils' departure; with His divine power, in virtue of the Divine Nature common to Him with Father and Spirit, He effected what His words conveyed. And so it was in matters spiritual, in Baptism and forgiveness of sins and Eucharist and the rest; so also it is now, in so far as we must refer to His human nature all that belongs to the Church and the Incarnation, but not in such a way as even to abstract from the Divine Nature. It is by reason of the Incarnation that we follow the Apostle in speaking of Christ as working directly upon the soul; but this is attributed to Him as working through the Holy Spirit, or directly to the Holy Spirit Himself. In actual fact it is the whole Godhead that works spiritual effects in the soul; but in order to develop the thought of Paul to the full we must include those effects in the work of Christ, both because (so far as attribution goes) He imparts the Holy Spirit, and because, in actual fact, He imparts Himself in and with the Holy Spirit. But to this subject we shall return anon.

All this we find in Holy Writ; and the revival of biblical studies has of necessity brought it to the fore. The Pauline epistles, with the Acts for background, occupy a position in the New Testament not unlike that of the prophets in the Old, with the historical books for background; the gospels in some respects may be compared to the Pentateuch. The comparison of course halts in many respects, but may serve to bring out the very important position in the New Testament of the Apostle of the Gentiles, with

whom even the Acts are in their main purpose concerned. And as has been said, this is the most novel and valuable fruit to be derived from the biblical revival, in so far as it may not have been sufficiently appreciated before. It must be admitted that St. Paul's epistles are apt to make rather difficult reading; indeed, we have St. Peter's word for it; needless to say, however, they are not too difficult for the clergy, and with their help the laity may derive great profit also. It was the conviction of the great fruit to be gathered, and of the greater ease with which it might be gathered, that most moved the present writer to join in undertaking the Westminster Version. The present article in its turn has been largely inspired by His Grace the Archbishop of Birmingham's article on a proposed revision of the catechism in the May number of the *CLERGY REVIEW*, for the changes made would be in the direction of the Pauline synthesis. "Suffer little children to come unto me"; if thus they might learn Christ more easily and more quickly, it would be an immense consolation to the present writer, for he had not hoped that fuller profit might so soon be taken of this divine synthesis in our schools.

But there is another, an even more powerful cause that is bringing to the fore the true Catholic Paulinism; it is the best answer to the Christ-hunger of our time, the most sure and solid foundation for building up the true knowledge and love of our Emmanuel. The fact and the desire of this knowledge and love appear to be in an especial manner marks of our own period of the Church's history; they are built upon frequent communion, itself reinforced by the devotion to the Sacred Heart, and they are the immediate aim of the new feast of Christ the King, with all that centres round that title. Now the Pauline doctrine of our union with Christ adds greatly to our understanding of all these, and gives them a new and deeper meaning. "It is no longer I that live," cries the Apostle, "it is Christ that liveth in me." The Holy Eucharist is the very food of this spiritual life, while the devotion to the Sacred Heart fosters sympathy with Him whose tender compassion is so ill requited, strengthening still more the desire of utter abandonment of self.

The feast and devotion of Christ the King may well be illustrated from the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius; St. Ignatius is extremely sober and objective in his devo-

tion, but here a personal trait appears. He was one of the greatest lovers of Our Blessed Lord, conspicuous for his personal love of the Saviour even among the saints, and showing it in many ways, for example, by the name he chose for his order, by his loving visit of the holy places, by his purpose to imitate as closely as possible Our Lord's actual life by a missionary life which should rely on private prayer rather than monastic observance; but when it comes to setting before others this personal devotion, he makes his appeal to that Christian chivalry wherein Spain, we may trust, even to-day abounds. His loyal devotion to Christ could not but take that form, and indeed the Great War showed how many are ready everywhere to answer such an appeal to generosity. It is a kind of second "foundation" that he is laying in his contemplation of Christ the King, upon which is to be built the remainder of the Exercises. The final consummation, indeed, with so objective a saint could only be the love of God in Himself and for Himself; but to this he leads us, as Paul does, from the thought of Christ ascended. "Seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated on the right hand of God; mind the things that are above, not the things that are on earth." That "he was rapt to Paradise, and heard utterances unutterable" could not tear Paul from the love of Christ, any more than mystical experience could shake Ignatius' loyalty to his Divine Captain. Such is the religion of the Incarnation, which is as firmly riveted to the manger of Bethlehem as to the throne of the Trinity, because upon both it sees the God-man, come down to the one to lift us up to the other. For Paul Incarnation and Atonement were inseparable in his one supreme thought of Jesus Christ.

And yet it is an evident fact that the Apostle does not linger upon the details of Christ's human life. They were already familiar to his readers, for whom he had words of more urgent import; and they were not essential to the setting forth of "my gospel," that interpretation and summing up of all things in Christ, that synthesis which it was his duty to preach to the world. But the Incarnation itself, human nature taken by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, is at the very centre of that synthesis.

What then is the synthesis? "It is no longer I that live, 'tis Christ liveth in me." The Christian lives in

Christ, and Christ lives in the Christian; and this is true, not only in what concerns his inward and individual life (as is most clear from the words quoted), but also of his outward and corporate life. With this latter, indeed, we may begin, because it is more easily understood, and because it may be said to bring us into more direct relation with the God-man as such, in the sense that the inward and spiritual life of the soul is due to the common action of the Blessed Trinity, and even in attribution belongs to the Holy Ghost.

Christ is the Head, the Church is the Body, the individual members of the Church make up the several parts of the body. The root-idea seems to be human marriage, wherein husband and wife, according to Gen. ii. 24, become one flesh, and are therefore treated as one body, but a body wherein the husband is head, as being (according to the very phrase we are wont to use) the head of the family. Hence to St. Paul it is one and the same thing to say (or quite definitely to imply, for he does not say it in so many words) that the Church is the bride of Christ, and to say that she is His body; but he prefers the latter phrase, as signifying a closer unity and common life. Being His body, she is one with Him, and from Him comes her whole activity, her whole life and growth and development.

It is in this way, therefore, that we must look upon the Church. Christ has left with her a threefold power, of teaching, governing and sanctifying; and in the exercise of each of these activities we must recognise, not a mere human person or institution, but Christ Himself using human means to effect His own purpose. It is not necessary here to treat scientifically of the threefold power, which will be found set forth in any adequate treatise or instruction upon the Church; all that I aim at presenting is the Pauline aspect of the Church, as part of the Pauline synthesis. It is, of course, at bottom the ordinary Catholic doctrine, but interpreted with peculiar power and harmony.

Protestants speak of the Church as coming between us and Christ, as though we had to go first to the Church and then, as it were, be passed on by her to Christ. But that is not the Catholic view, and least of all St. Paul's. Even in matters external, it is Christ acting through and

in the Church. "He that heareth you heareth me." Christ is with His Church to the end, even as the head is with the body; the authority is His, the organisation of government is His, the direction of all lawful activity is His. Our primary obedience is to Christ, and only in a secondary sense is directed to those whom He chooses to represent Him. The doctrine likewise that reaches us is Christ's, far more fully guaranteed to be such than is the wisdom of any individual commands; the ultimate guarantee is infallibility, but revealed truth is conveyed to us through many sure channels, and it is the living Christ who is teaching us in the living Church. Most of all is He present and active in the Church's ministry, wherein it is in the very person of Christ that the minister, priest or lay, confers the sacraments, and that the priest offers the adorable sacrifice of the Mass. We can never love the Church as Christ would have us love her until we contemplate her as alive with His life and active with His divine energy. We recognise the human element; it may, alas, be all too clearly in evidence. But through and beyond that, we behold the God-man working in and through and for the Church, fulfilling Himself in her as she is fulfilled in Him. But for Protestants all must needs be human, not merely in the Catholic Church but in their own organization; for what possible guarantee have they that they are getting hold of Christ at all? Certainly not the fancies of a preacher who upon his own showing is well-nigh blaspheming if he calls his own very human discourse the word of God.

"But if anyone hath not the Spirit of Christ, that man is not of Christ." There is an inward aspect of the Christian's union with Christ that is still more important, inasmuch as what is outward is for the sake of what is inward. This inward union is partly fact and partly ideal. St. Paul generally means by "faith" a living faith, which has its proper effects in sanctifying grace and charity; whence also he is wont to speak of "faith" as "obedience." In the same concrete way he is wont to presuppose in his writing that union with the Church in her outward teaching and government and ministry brings with it that inward union with Christ towards which her ministrations are directed. No doubt it usually did so; and in his eagerness to set forth the Christian life in all its fulness, he does not stop to work out all the possibili-

ties of the case, the possibility of grace without external membership of the Church, or of external membership without grace. In that sense he is setting forth an ideal, not (alas!) sheer fact, but it would be a terrible perversion of his meaning to suppose that he does not teach the absolute obligation of belonging visibly and externally to the external organization of the visible Church. In this regard the expression "Mystical Body," or at all events the term "Mystical," has been greatly abused, though no doubt often enough in good faith; it is not a Pauline term, and is so open to misinterpretation at the present time that one almost regrets that it ever came into use. It is convenient enough, however, if rightly understood, since we must evidently make it clear that we are not speaking of Christ's *physical* Body.

For St. Paul, however, the ideal in the fact is "one body and one spirit," or, as we should say, "one soul and one body"; a fact, in so far as there really is one body, quickened by one Spirit, but an ideal in so far as the Spirit does not always have even that effect which is necessary for the grace and salvation of the individual. St. Paul was too much concerned to press home the big things themselves to work out their niceties; nevertheless we see clearly that he realized that Christians could sin, and sin grievously, and we see also at times, though not so easily, that he understood that those outside the Church could be in a state of grace. Such passages occur, for example, in the opening chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. It must be remembered that mortal sin does not necessarily destroy the supernatural habits of faith and hope, so that the supernatural bond uniting the soul to God is not altogether severed; and in the same way excommunication, to which St. Paul had ready recourse, does not completely destroy the outward bond of Church membership. Such weakening of internal or external union, however, with both of which St. Paul was familiar, would of themselves point to further possibilities.

But it is the internal unity in its fulness, the indwelling of the Blessed Trinity, that is the Apostle's chief theme. This, too, as has been said, is for the Apostle the Christ-life of the Christian; yet he treats it in such a way as to prepare the way with St. John for the more

direct attribution of it to the Holy Ghost. If we were to attempt some distinction, we should have to say that St. Paul tends to assign what is more outward to Christ, such as all that belongs to the Church, and what is more inward to the Holy Ghost, such as all that belongs to grace; but this is a distinction which the Apostle himself is far from observing accurately. Again and again he lets us see that Christ Himself is within us; and so for that matter does St. John. It was in His human nature that Christ instituted Church and sacraments and all that works upon us from without, and which therefore is rightly reserved to Him, but it is in unity with the other two Persons of the Blessed Trinity that He accomplishes the inward effect. We may well ascribe it all to Him, as we do the miracle, and we do so truly; but we must not exclude the other Persons, and we must remember that in formal attribution the inward spiritual effect belongs to the Holy Ghost, for reasons that would take too long to expound here.

Paul loves nevertheless to see Christ everywhere, within as well as without! That transformation of the soul which is sanctifying grace, that direction and impulse upon intellect and will, that presentation of Himself by God to the soul as the all-satisfying and all-embracing object of intellect and will—all this and more must be understood as the Christ-life of the soul, Christ dwelling and acting therein as powerfully as the soul of its own free will allows Him to dominate and penetrate and permeate it, until it can say, "It is no longer I that live, it is Christ that liveth in me." Death to all else but Christ! Death it truly was, when the soul renounced all else to follow Him, when it doffed the old Adam to don the new, when it renounced its old life and all its ways so utterly that Paul speaks of it as thereby a new creature by a new creation. So in effect it is, but it is to be so still more; the soul must advance towards more perfect crucifixion, to more whole-hearted surrender, in order that Christ may freely be offered the more total mastery. Absolute control, alas, man never offers Him; perhaps Our Blessed Lady was the only mere creature for whom to receive a grace was to accept it in its fulness. If even heroic sanctity may fall short of this, much more may virtue of a more ordinary type. For all, therefore, remain vast fields yet to conquer—and in the consciousness of

that very fact the cleansing pain of ineffective love and the sure safeguard of humility.

Such is the magnificent synthesis of St. Paul, though all too inadequately expressed; but it remains to show, if still inadequately, that it is a synthesis, the one pure, simple and gleaming truth whereof all other doctrines may be reckoned aspects or facets. If we look Godward, as at the very beginning we should, we understand at once how fundamental to this synthesis are the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and of the Incarnation. God alone can deify, as St. Thomas says, so that Our Lord could not make us partakers of the Divine Nature by adoption if He did not possess that Nature as His own. To accomplish His work, He must be both truly divine and truly human; and in that double pre-requisite of the divine economy we have the Incarnation. Then we ask, how can He be God? And we at once perceive how becoming it was that the mystery of the Blessed Trinity should be revealed as the background of the Incarnation. He comes from the Father, remaining one with Him; He becomes not merely one body but one soul with us, in communicating to us His own Spirit, "the Spirit of Jesus"—and in communicating the Spirit He communicates Himself.

Our place in the external and organized life of the Church we have already seen to be due to our being members of His Body, with a true function in the life of the whole. Such indeed should be the life of the family, the life of the State, the common life of all States in regard of their mutual relations, the life of all mankind; neither individuals nor States can shake off their mutual dependence and responsibility, wherein they should find the moral and spiritual counterpart in their inward and outward membership of the Mystical Body of Christ. The sacrificial and sacramental life of man is evidently naught but Christ, who still offers up to God through His priests that death to which the Incarnation gives infinite value, and still administers through His priests the sacramental means of answering grace, and most of all Himself as Eucharistic food.

Upon the side of conduct also, therefore, and not merely of doctrine, Christ is thus our all in all, helping forward and satisfying the will and heart no less than the intel-

lect. To Him all things move, man by his conscious aim, but all things else as being designed by God to help forward man to Christ; indirectly Christ is their goal likewise, summing up all things in Himself. To the Apostle He was not merely the still and hidden voice of inner grace, but revealed Himself openly to impart direction and encouragement, establishing thus a familiarity founded (no doubt) upon the mystical state. To the Apostle, therefore, the thought of Jesus was everything; and from his frequent use of the name we may infer (though without complete certainty) that he was wont to repeat it often, and to find in such simplified thought and prayer all the unfathomable riches of Christ, as far as it was given him to make them his own. Such a practice is the main feature of the Jesus Psalter and some other devotions, which may teach us in like manner a loving familiarity with the sacred name; the more we learn with Paul to put into it, the more also we shall find in the simple use of it. It is not in the abundance and novelty of thoughts that progress in prayer truly lies, but in the grip that one or two essential thoughts, such as that of Jesus, have upon us, in the meaning they have for us, in the power they have to dominate us.

We find it difficult to realise the historical circumstances of Paul's work, especially upon its Jewish side; for on the one hand he observed faithfully the Mosaic Law and the traditional customs of his nation, while on the other hand he fought vigorously in doctrine and practice against the imposition of such a yoke upon his Gentile converts. He fought so well and won such utter victory that we cannot easily picture the battle. All this belongs in a certain sense to the negative side of his work; it was ephemeral precisely because it removed for ever the barriers to the full development of Christianity. But we can understand and make our own the positive content of his mind and work, and indeed it is our duty and glorious privilege to profit thereby. We may sum it up in conclusion in terms of the *pleroma*, the "fulness" alike of Christ and of ourselves. Christ reaches His uttermost fulness in His Mystical Body, when His Personality, so to speak, covers more and more all His elect, whom He incorporates into Himself on earth and hereafter. At the end of time, to use the Pauline phrase, He will have attained the full measure of His stature.

And we attain our own fulness in Christ, being developed beyond all natural power or need unto deification, so as to be one with God, as said our Catholic forefathers, in ghostly onehead, through our union and unity with Christ our Lord.

THE SEPTCENTENARY AT PADUA

BY ALICE CURTAYNE.

IN April, 1930, through the Cardinal Secretary of State, the Pope communicated to the Generals of the Franciscan Order throughout the world instructions to observe with special solemnity the seven hundredth anniversary of the death of Saint Antony of Padua. This saint died on June 13th, 1231. On the same day of 1931, therefore, his septcentenary was celebrated, not by a day's rejoicing, but by the formal opening of a year's commemoration, to terminate on June 13th, 1932.

A great machinery was thus set in motion last June and the response to the direction from Rome is now manifest everywhere. Months before the opening of the septcentenary year, articles on Saint Antony began to appear with increasing frequency in Catholic periodicals, advertisements of pilgrimages to Padua became prominent in the Press and the first flow began of what is now a huge spate of souvenir volumes of every description and of all degrees of literary and scholarly merit. In Padua, of course, the preparations have been vast and elaborate. All the public monuments were cleaned; the apse of the Basilica of Saint Antony was newly decorated; and the ceremonies for the opening of the anniversary year planned on an immense scale, with a Cardinal Legate participating, the glory of this event being subsequently somewhat dimmed by the Fascist trouble. Two exhibitions were opened in the city: the Thirteenth International and an International Exhibition of Modern Sacred Art. During the whole month of September, the entire city of Padua was illuminated. Innumerable Congresses have been organized, Missionary, Catholic Action, and what not, and a Social Week has been planned. In Lisbon, in Portugal, there have been preparations almost equally elaborate and thorough. The ripple of the commotion has now spread everywhere, to publishers, artists, designers, the heads of railway and steamship companies, touring agencies, travel organizers, hotel managers and caterers, wholesale religious art dealers, printers, bookbinders, compositors, down to the retailers of oleographs and plaster statues.

It is worth enquiring what manner of man this was who can thus set up a discreet commotion throughout

the world seven hundred years after his death. Who is he with whose spirit Christendom is now seeking communion? His very relationship to time is interesting. Did he stumble upon the secret of perpetuity, and can we in turn discover from him how to cheat the treacherous brevity of existence? Certainly he eluded with signal triumph that fate held up in the Book of Wisdom as a thing to be dreaded: *And there are some of whom there is no memorial; who are perished, as if they had never been, and are born as if they had never been born. . . .*

Saint Antony of Padua, known chiefly to the world as a wonderworker, was not a citizen of Padua. He was a Portuguese, born in Lisbon, but his remains are enshrined in Padua, and that city has always claimed him. He was not formed in religion by the Franciscan Rule, for the Franciscans had not even formulated a Rule when he joined them. It is of curious speculative interest to notice that the Franciscan Order, as then constituted, could not have produced Antony. He was an ordained priest in the Canons Regular of Saint Augustine, one of their most brilliant and cherished members, when he transferred, after great travail of spirit, to the Franciscans. The Franciscan movement was at that time in its first and greenest youth: there still surrounded it the atmosphere of what is new, untested, suspect. It was not yet organized and its way of life was remarkable for a certain formlessness, not considered promising by the established Orders. Antony died very young, at the age of thirty-six: his early demise makes his enduring memory all the stranger. Miracles did not facilitate matters for him anything like to the extent that is imagined. He was not at all famed as a wonder-worker in his lifetime.

Looking back along the seven hundred years, we find that interval of time like a veil that obscures him. We must dispose of it. Something happened to the subject of our enquiry during those intervening centuries. His fame shifted focus. It is now concentrated wholly on his miracles. But out of the forty-six miracles accepted for his canonization, only *one* occurred before his death. The rush of miracles was posthumous and we are interested in the living Antony. But all contact with miracle must not be denied to him in his lifetime, for

that position would be equidistant from the truth. The marvellous certainly hung about him, as much part of him as the shadow he cast on the long white roads of Italy. But there is one thing peculiar to the few miracles of his life, hall-marked as historically certain by the students of sources. Antony always worked them in subordination to the main enterprise of his life, his preaching. The purpose of the miracles was to facilitate, safeguard, or even make possible his preaching labours. This is clearly seen in the miracles of the Sermon to the Fishes and Bonvillo's Mule. The Sermon to the Fishes was provoked by Antony's congregation suddenly deserting him in the middle of a sermon. They faded away and left him talking to the air. But their rout was a triumph. There is hardly a doubt that this professedly Catholic congregation was made up of Waldenses (who, of course, always styled themselves Catholics). The first gigantic difficulty in tackling these was to convince them that they were not the cream of the Catholic flock. It is clear that Antony had found a way, by some swift thrust of logic. Being left without an audience of men, he went down to the seashore and addressed the waves. The miracle of the fishes rising to the surface to listen to him came as a sort of divine approbation of his having pointed the Franciscan defence into a wedge of attack. The miracle of Bonvillo's Mule adoring the Blessed Sacrament flashed in precisely the same sort of stress: in the thick of the Albigensian war in Toulouse, where Antony found himself very hard driven, even fighting for his life.

One last miracle in this connection is tempting to mention, though we cannot linger upon the details. Once when Antony was preaching in France, a novice stole his manuscript of notes. The book was restored to the saint by a miracle. But, in the meantime, and this is the illuminating point of the story, Antony was in despair over his loss. It is evident then that in his preaching he frankly depended to an enormous extent, if not wholly, on preliminary preparation with notes. And this is matter for encouragement. In the popular response he provoked, this youthful Portuguese was the most famous preaching friar of the thirteenth century. Consider attentively then this picture in order to see his miracles in their true relation to his life: the crowds that were the talk of Europe assembling to hear him

and Antony in the background wringing his hands because he cannot find his notebook. Obviously he was not permitted to spare himself any labour or grind, to equip himself to be a teacher of men. Antony's miracles never redounded to his personal convenience. But a slant of the marvellous was certainly lent, as it were, to emphasize the effect of his efforts. He personally did not gain in ease of life, might one say, but his straining attempt at recovery was sealed with divine approval; his campaign was starred. The peril of that hour was very real; the air of Europe full of menace to believers. One need but recall that the Albigenses of Southern France had armed government secretly on their side to envisage something of the danger which then threatened Europe from within. The suppression of the Albigensian movement, in which struggle Antony played a large part, was like the lifting of a nightmare from the Middle Ages.

All Antony's fame in life was due to his renown as a preacher. When he was first called upon to preach at that ordination ceremony at Forlì, as a stop-gap and by accident, the power he immediately displayed was accounted very strange. His astonished colleagues who heard him could not be expected to fathom all at once what is so evident when his brief life can be considered in its unity; he had attained his uncommon acquirements quite naturally from his circumstances. Being son of a knight at the Court of the King of Portugal, his early training in court circles had given him that essential poise, which is all the more alluring the more it is unconscious, and which is perhaps the one enviable concomitant of noble rank (though far from being an invariable concomitant). It is quite clear from the trend of the traditional stories that Antony never lost that princely bearing acquired in youth; he retained it in his carriage, in the turn of his head, in his gestures. Furthermore, he was not only a highly cultured man, having had the best education the Europe of his day could provide, but in addition his eight years of concentrated study at Coimbra, as a Canon Regular of Saint Augustine, had resulted in his being a specialist in Theology and in Scripture. As a religious, he had been formed by a way of life famous for honourable tradition and for scholarly pursuits. But he had, too, that power which is gained only by repeated interior victory.

There is only one picture of Saint Antony which conveys the least hint of that compelling personality of his. It is that painting by an unknown artist, said to have been finished in the saint's lifetime, and preserved at Spoleto. Notice that it is the same face as the portrait by Giotto, or the Giotto school, painted in the Basilica at Padua: the same delicate features, touched by an air of suffering; the same large, eloquent eyes common to the southern races. All the other paintings of Antony, Murillo's, Ehrich's and the rest, while being beautiful and interesting in varying degrees, are, of course, without value as likenesses. But studying the Giotto and Spoleto portraits attentively, while the former seems to lack expression, the latter is full of disquieting power. It is impossible to glance casually at even a poor copy of this painting without an immediate sense of disturbance. The combination is so unusual of almost feminine sweetness and boyish candour in a face yet stamped, even marred, with experience, and with eyes so steady in their expression of inflexible resolve.

When Antony was given the mission of preacher to the whole of Italy, as a result of his being accidentally discovered at Forlì, he set out at once, with great earnestness of purpose, to fulfil it. He was then twenty-six years of age. One is perplexed how to describe the nature of the response he provoked within the sphere of his action, that is, in Italy and France. He discovered within himself a power of kindling the masses with his own fire and the Church had not hitherto witnessed what he brought to pass. The only concrete parallel that comes to mind is that phenomenon of Irish country life in the late Spring, when some toilers in their struggle with the land, decide to clear the furze off a mountain-side and then the dwellers in the valley are occasionally favoured with a spectacular display of fire. First there is a premonitory spiral of smoke; then a centre of light can be distinguished, from which creeping threads of fire radiate, join, diverge again, increase into avenues, and leap into racing walls of flame, that strengthen, extend, and meet in every direction until presently the whole mountainside is blazing magnificently under the night sky. That picture held in the mind conveys some slight notion of the conflagratory effect of Antony's preaching.

Of course, his fame, while being fully as scenic, was not quite so swift. He worked with comparative deliberation and with an occasional check. He began by preaching to half-empty churches, because good preachers being then exceedingly rare and preaching on the whole suffering from a decline, there was a correspondingly bored indifference to sermons. But he never preached twice in the same half-empty church. In general the people's response was prompt. The churches packed to hear him until windows and doors were filled with faces and all the square outside massed with people. Antony was forced to take a platform out into the streets the better to command his audiences. But when the numbers mounted to thirty thousand, the streets and city squares were found cramping, and the platform had to be carried out of the towns to a bare hillside, say, or to a meadow, and thither that spectacular mass of people followed him, trudging long roads through the thick dust of summer, and on inclement winter days.

The details of his power of attraction are such a commonplace in the "Lives" that one must apologize for repeating them here. Within a year of his accepting the mission of preacher, when it was known in a city or town that he was coming, shops were shuttered up and the Law Courts closed in order that no one should be forced to miss the event. The people's demonstrative enthusiasm became such that he had to be protected by a bodyguard of young men, who drew a cordon around the platform while he was preaching and held off the onrush of admirers afterwards. When the crowds moving to one of his sermons crested a distant hill, some onlooker likened them to a dense flock of birds rising in flight. Their manner of listening also made a deep impression on observers, for these thirty thousand were in the habit of standing without movement, and voicelessly, listening together as one man might listen. But sometimes when the saint paused, they sighed in unison, and then the sound was like a great wind sighing. Another eye-witness left on record this vivid detail: he said that large numbers used to assemble at the platform *the night before* a sermon to make sure of a good place. Crowds would be seen crossing the fields at night, carrying lanterns to guide themselves. And all those lights flitting across the dark countryside reminded the eye-witness

of some strange concourse of spectres.

The pilgrimage crowds to Padua would not consider it an exaggeration to say that the echoes of Antony's great preaching linger yet in that city. But how assess the full value of that effort of his, the violence of which killed him within ten years? There is a heavy imprint of his preaching even in the legal archives of the city. He was not content in his sermons with denouncing usury and usurers, but he denounced also the law that was favourable to the latter and merciless to their victims. So successful were his attacks that he forced the rulers of Padua to revise the statutes, in order that a man could not be imprisoned with confiscation of his goods if he failed in making payment of exorbitant interest on a loan. The name of Antony of Padua was inserted in that change which he enforced in the penal code and the document stands to his honour to this day in the archives of Padua. There is a deep reflection of his preaching, too, in the chronicles of his period. All the contemporary annalists bear witness to the grateful Christian peace that spread over the land as a result of Antony's sermons.

There was a certain quality about his preaching which helps to explain how the attention of the masses was riveted upon him: his moral courage. When it occurred to Antony to attack an abuse, he did not know the nature of fear. It is said that other famous preachers who came to listen to him shivered at his boldness. Once, when he was invited to preach at a Synod in France, he paralyzed the congregation by denouncing the Bishop, who was placidly seated in the episcopal chair to hear him: "You, with the mitre on your head. . . ." (But how convey in English the shattering effect of that opening crash, *Tibi loquar cornute?*) Antony could not comprehend keeping silence, or making evasions, through motives of prudence. If this uncompromising directness made him a disconcerting colleague to work with, and perhaps a rather trying subordinate, one can readily see how it polarized the interest of the people.

There was an element of surprise in his preaching which conveys to us to-day, across the centuries, some dim idea of what his personal magnetism must have been. Antony's mild countenance was persuasive of affection, yet he had a tongue that could blister on

occasion. This is clear even from the miserable, dubiously authenticated and wholly unsatisfactory outlines of his sermons that remain to us. There was then an unexpected and piquant contrast between the disarming sweetness of his demeanour and the biting sting of his message. He had that common effect of a powerful mind upon the weaker: a communication of hope. Not only did his hearers believe at his word that they were masters of themselves and of the world; but such sustenance did those pathetic crowds draw from his sermons that one would imagine he reversed for them the whole ordering of the universe and changed the very colour of day.

Such a volcanic affirmation could not be without far-flung reverberations in thirteenth century literature. All these, wherever they occur, are of profound interest, but the scope of the present article does not permit us to attempt their ordering. As an indication, however, of this field of enquiry, it is a fact that some pale glow of Antony's preaching is reflected even in Dante's *Vita Nuova*, and this although Dante was born thirty-four years after the death of the famous preacher. It is generally conceded that it was through the preaching of the friars, coupled chiefly with the Albigensian defeat and the heavy effect of the Inquisition, that the tone so notably altered in the love lyrics of the later troubadours and the spiritual element began to supersede the carnal. Instead of writing endless vapidities about the mouth which he wants to kiss, and the eyes of flame, and the hair that has caught him in a mesh and so on, occasionally imparting a tang to his insipid vapourings only by the frankest expression of sensual passion, the poet now began to envisage his lady as an angel descended from Heaven, until we attain that loveliest sonnet by Dante's fascinating friend, Guido Cavalcanti:

Who is she coming, whom all gaze upon,
Who makes the air all tremulous with light . . .

And Dante's immortal love story is, of course, the supreme expression of that agreeable change.

Antony's method of mortification, the means by which he built up that inner life, which became so powerfully compelling, was wholly individual. We hear nothing in his case about hair shirts, or scourgings, or

vigils, or any of the drastic measures of the more frightening sort. But he once obeyed directions which were certainly a blunder on the part of a superior. That act of obedience looked like committing intellectual suicide (the world cannot be asked to distinguish). Antony acted in the full belief that his acquiescence was final, in which belief resided, of course, the whole worth of his submission. Let us briefly marshal the facts: he had been a student all his life, and when his strange call to the Franciscans came, he was an ordained priest among the Canons Regular of Saint Augustine. He had then spent eight years at their house in Coimbra, the centre in all Portugal most famous for strict observance and for learning, and where they conducted a renowned school, attended not only by clerks, but by laymen, too. He aspired to martyrdom, was sent to Morocco on a mission which proved entirely fruitless, was recalled, suffered shipwreck, drifted to Sicily, somehow reached the historical Chapter of Mats at Assisi, at the conclusion of which he humbly asked to be assigned somewhere in the Italian Province. Whereupon, by way of complete anti-climax, he was sent to Monte Paolo. This was a small hostel for a half-dozen or so lay brothers in the wilds of Emilia. It was thought that, as Antony was a priest, he would be useful there to say Mass for the brethren. His other duties were entirely menial: he scrubbed floors, scraped saucepans, hewed wood, fetched water, washed piles of greasy dishes. At Monte Paolo the erudite son of a courtier learned how to live like the ignorant son of a menial. Humanly speaking he was extinguished. All the elaborate training of his early boyhood, the grace and charm of his family court circle, the profound and accurate scholarship so laboriously acquired in a life of study were rigidly suppressed behind a duster and broom in the wilderness.

The thing had gone on for nine months when the door of his release was opened suddenly and finally, by one of those accidents of Providence. But the subsequent discovery of him does not disturb in the least the fullness of his renunciation. When Antony began to trudge the daily round at Monte Paolo, all the days of all the years of his life stretched out before him in the same grey circle. Nothing was lacking to the effectiveness of the trial so far as regards its appearance of permanence, of finality. He was flung back upon himself, isolated

from his kind, and forced to contemplate the complete collapse of all that he had built. He must have known the oppression of that fear, often a factor to be reckoned with in religious life, the fear of mental deterioration. It is happily not frequent that obedience confronts a man under such a savage aspect. The killing and subsequent impassive assistance at the atrophy of the affections is not on the same level of painfulness as the same operation performed on the intellectual powers.

Not only has Antony's fame widely shifted focus in that interval of seven hundred years, but his cult, at least in these islands, has become somewhat wildly misdirected. He is the saint of larger issues, both national and individual, than the finding of a latch-key, or the safe conduct of a worthless letter. He is quite peculiarly a patron saint for England in this hour of the Church's conflict here, for he, too, combated at that junction where the Faith confronts the union of heresy and paganism. He died at the height of the struggle, but knowing every phase of it, having savoured its atmosphere and directed the resistance for ten years. An effort for the re-ordering of his cult seems indeed indicated. Francis Thompson once wrote a poem to Saint Antony, very appropriate in this regard. It now appears to have completely dropped out of popular knowledge, but it is worthy of being restored to currency as a septcentenary prayer:

"Thou find'st, men say, the thing that's lost. Behold
This England, Antony, which knows thee not:
For she hath lost
An antique Pearl of price.
Her loss is old,
Wherefore she hath forgot
All but the lack which teacheth her its cost;
And quests with many a void device,
Indeed unwitting what.
And with religion vain,
All things she searcheth that are for her pain;
With veriest prayer
Importunes leading on all paths that err.
Yield, Antony, her blind
Petition, after God's own mind
And those calm ways the unhasty heavens allot:
The things she seeketh give her not to find,
Give her to find the thing she seeketh not."

THE APOSTOLIC BLESSING WITH PLENARY INDULGENCE IN ARTICULO MORTIS

BY THE REV. JOSEPH MCKENNA, *P.P. of St. Wulstan's,
Fleetwood*

THE purpose of the Church is to lead us to Heaven. By her teaching she directs us, and assists us by her sacrifice and sacraments; and when death looms before us, she puts forth all her power that it may be the gateway to eternal happiness. At such a time, especially, she shows herself a true *Pia Mater*—a strong and tender mother. In order, as far as possible, that none may be deprived of her powerful aid, she commands her priests with the care of souls to proffer their services, even though uninvited,¹ to be diligent in the care of the dying,² and, where possible, to assist them to the end.³ She relaxes her discipline, and grants to all priests, whether *approbati* or not, faculties to absolve from all sins and censures, even though reserved.⁴ She lays down that care be taken to administer Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction when the sick are in such a state of body and mind as to be able to profit most by them.⁵ And in order that, if possible, the soul may leave the world free not only from the guilt of sin but also from all debt of temporal punishment, she empowers all priests attending the sick to impart the Apostolic Blessing and Plenary Indulgence.⁶ This Blessing and Indulgence is the subject of the present paper.

The date of the granting of the first plenary indulgence for the dying seems uncertain. O'Kane writes: "From the earliest ages of the Church bishops were invited from time to time to give their blessing to the dying, and when

¹ Cf. *Rituale Romanum* Titul. 5, ch. 4, §1.

² Canon 468, §1.

³ Cf. *Rit. Rom.* Titul 5, ch. 5, §1, 1st Synod Westminster Decree 25, §7, Liverpool Synod of 1869.

⁴ Canon 882.

⁵ *Rit. Rom.* 4, 4, §2 and 5, 1, §1.

⁶ Canon 468, §2.

given by the Popes, or those specially delegated by them, it was no doubt very often accompanied by a plenary indulgence."⁷ Catalanus adduces, without attaching great importance to it, the case of the Emperor, Louis the Debonnaire, in the ninth century; at the approach of death he summoned Bishop Drago to bless him and to do what was usual at the departure of the soul.⁸ We have evidence of the indulgence from the eleventh century onwards. "Grants of such an indulgence are met with frequently in documents of the time, being sometimes made by the Pope directly, sometimes through the confessor's mediation."⁹ In 1075 Gregory VII sent to the Bishop of Liège an indulgence *in articulo mortis*, and two years earlier an indulgence, seemingly of the same kind, to Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln.¹⁰ The Bollandists record that St. Clare (†1253), being at the point of death, petitioned and obtained from Innocent IV a plenary indulgence for the sins of her whole life, with the apostolic blessing.¹¹ Catalanus hesitates as to whether this was a case of a plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis* such as is now given.¹² In the fourteenth century the Black Death spread through Europe; moved by the plight of the people, Clement VI and Gregory XI granted the indulgence.¹³ Thus on January 19th, 1349, Bishop Endydon of Winchester announced to his diocese that "the Most Holy Father in Christ, Our Lord the Supreme Pontiff, had in response to the petition of himself and his subjects, on account of the imminent great mortality, granted to all the people of the diocese . . . who should confess their sins with sincere repentance to any priest they might choose, a plenary indulgence at the hour of death, if they departed in the true faith, in unity with the holy Roman Church, and obedience and devotion to Our Lord the Supreme Pontiff and his successors, the

⁷ *Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual*, §958.

⁸ Catalanus, *Comment. in Rit. Rom. Titul.* 5, ch. 6, §1.

⁹ Lépiciér: *Indulgences*, p. 294 (3rd Eng. edit.).

¹⁰ Cf. Beringer-Steinen: *Die Ablässe*, vol. 1, §1020 (4th French edit.).

¹¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, August, vol. 2, p. 764.

¹² *Loc. cit.*, §2: "An ista indulgentia ad piacularem Papalem Benedictionem pertineat de qua in praesenti agimus, non ausim definire."

¹³ *Pia Mater*, § Quod si satis.

Roman Bishops."¹⁴ By the sixteenth century the practice was well established; according to St. Charles Borromeo (†1584), the Pope was accustomed in his day to grant to the bishops of the province of Milan the faculty of imparting the Apostolic Blessing with the plenary indulgence, and even of subdelegating.¹⁵

Though the practice was established by the sixteenth century, numbers of the faithful could not benefit by it. Down to the time of Benedict XIV (1740-1758) it was usually granted to individual petitioners or on account of zealous work for the Church.¹⁶ In fact the view was propounded that it should be given only to those who had merited well of the Church. The basis of this opinion was that some pious work or works should be performed for the gaining of an indulgence; in the case of the dying no pious work at all could be prescribed, or only a light one suited to their state and strength. To supply for this lack of pious works, it was held that the good done for the Church during life must be taken into account. This reasoning did not commend itself to Benedict XIV. In what way, he asked, had the plague-stricken people of England merited so well of the Church that they were so favoured by Clement VI and Gregory XI? Not satisfied with a rhetorical question, he adduced the decision of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, given on April 13th, 1675, that a plenary indulgence could be conferred, rightfully and usefully, on those even who had in no wise excelled in good works for the Church: (Censuit Congregatio) "indulgentiae plenariae largitionem in eos etiam, qui singularibus in Ecclesiam meritis nequaquam excellere, recte et utiliter conferri atque diffundi."¹⁷

Still the fact remains that in numbers of cases the faithful were precluded from the benefits of the indulgence. The cause of this was the restricted delegation that was conferred. In the beginning the indulgence was given by the Pope himself, personally or by letter. Sometimes a particular bishop or priest was delegated for a particular case. General delegation was the excep-

¹⁴ Cf. Gasquet *The Black Death*, p. 127, Lépicier l.c., p. 294.

¹⁵ Cf. Catalanus l.c., §3 and *Pia Mater*, § Quapropter.

¹⁶ Berenger-Steinen, §1022.

¹⁷ Cf. *Pia Mater*, § Quod si satis.

tion, and it was restricted by a time limitation. Thus in the case of the indulgence granted by Clement VI to Winchester, though the faculty was given to all the confessors of the diocese, still they held it only from January to Easter, 1349, with a further extension to Michaelmas.¹⁸

Up to 1747 the general rule was that each bishop desiring the faculty had to apply to the Pope. The faculty, when granted through the Secretariate of Secret Briefs, endured for three years; at the expiry of that period a fresh application was required.¹⁹ Only the bishop or his suffragan (auxiliary) could impart the blessing; no one, save the suffragan, could be sub-delegated. To this rule there were two regular exceptions: The ordinary confessor of nuns could be sub-delegated for his charges, and, in particular cases of necessity, a particular priest could be sub-delegated by the bishop. With regard to this latter, he could impart the blessing only at night.²⁰ These two exceptions held everywhere; in some places, for example in Milan, the bishops enjoyed the power of freely sub-delegating.

In 1747 a change was made by Benedict XIV. In 1710 he was a minor Consultor in the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics. In that year two requests were presented to the Congregation: (1) One from the bishops who already possessed the faculty; they asked for an extension beyond the triennial limit, and also for greater powers of sub-delegation, so that the faithful outside the cathedral city or in the remote parts of the diocese might benefit by the blessing; and (2) another from certain vicars-capitular, vicars-apostolic, and minor prelates to obtain the faculty granted to bishops. Both petitions were refused by the Congregation.²¹ Later, as Bishop of Ancona and as Archbishop of Bologna, Benedict was convinced of the reasonableness of the petitions. It was impossible satisfactorily to succour the sick in person, and at the same time carry out the onerous duties of the

¹⁸ Cf. Gasquet loc. cit.

¹⁹ Cf. *Pia Mater*, § Hactenus huiusmodi. According to Beringer-Steinen, §1022, the rule was: Two years' faculty to bishops in Italy, three years to those outside Italy, ten years to those in the Indies.

²⁰ Cf. *Pia Mater*, § Hactenus huiusmodi.

²¹ *Pia Mater*, § Hanc porro.

episcopate.²² In 1740 he became Pope, and in 1747, by the Bull, *Pia Mater* of April 5th, extended the faculty.

His purpose in this action was to make the blessing more accessible to the people. He did not intend that the bishops should be relieved of the obligation of tending the sick. On the contrary, he exhorted them to impart the blessing personally to the dying, as far as possible—and that not only to the rich and powerful, but to the poor and downtrodden, after the example of Our Lord, who visited not the son of the ruler but the servant of the centurion.²³ But they were given wider powers of sub-delegation. Within the cathedral city they could appoint one priest or more, secular or regular, to give the blessing, even in the daytime, when they were lawfully prevented. Throughout the diocese they could sub-delegate as many as they considered necessary, according to the number of souls.²⁴ The time limit also was changed. Those bishops who already, in 1747, possessed the faculty were confirmed in their power, and that, not for three years, but as long as they held the sees for which they obtained it. With regard to those holding the faculty who were translated to other sees, and those to whom briefs had not already been sent, and newly appointed bishops, it was decreed that application must be made in each case to the Pope, and the faculty, when granted, would endure as long as they held the sees for which they obtained it.²⁵ Inferior prelates with independent active jurisdiction over clergy and laity could also obtain the permission for a similar period and with like power of sub-delegation, provided they carried out the terms of the Bull, *Quod Sancta* of December 15th, 1740.²⁶ Since the delegated jurisdiction concerned a favour and not justice, it was not to lapse on the death of the Pope granting it. Nor was sub-delegation to cease on the death, retirement, or translation of the sub-delegator; it was to endure till the new superior took possession of his territory; it was to cease only on its

²² Ibid., § Neque porro.

²³ Ibid., § Hac igitur ratione.

²⁴ Ibid., § Utque praeterea.

²⁵ Ibid., § Si vero aliquem.

²⁶ Ibid., § Insuper pro prelatiis.

positive withdrawal by the sub-delegator or one of his successors in office.²⁷

Missionary countries received special consideration later. In 1753, by the Bull, *Apostolicum Ministerium* of May 30th, the privilege, with power of sub-delegating other priests, was granted to the vicars-apostolic of England. In 1772 Clement XIV granted in perpetuity the same power of imparting and sub-delegating to all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, vicars-apostolic, prefects and superiors of missions, whether secular or regular, in missionary lands.²⁸

For some time after the promulgation of *Pia Mater* the power of sub-delegation was interpreted strictly. In 1775 certain doubts were submitted to the Congregation of Indulgences from a Breton diocese. It was asked: 1°. Must a bishop sub-delegate a few priests in order to safeguard reverence for the blessing and to foster a great desire for it? The answer was in the affirmative. 2°. Can he sub-delegate all the confessors of the diocese, so that not even one of his flock may be deprived of the favour? The answer was in the negative. 3°. Can he sub-delegate directly and specifically all parish priests or several dignitaries, and authorize them to depute, once or several times, in case of necessity, any other confessor? The answer was that this could be done in the case of rural parish priests.²⁹ This restriction of sub-delegation seems out of harmony with the spirit of *Pia Mater*. In spite of the answers of the Congregation, a milder practice was introduced. In certain dioceses of France, for example, it became customary for the bishop to authorise all the parish priests or all the confessors. In 1878 the Bishop of Tarentaise questioned the Congregation of Indulgences on the subject. The reply was that the bishop could subdelegate one or more priests, secular or regular, according to the population of the diocese; and if he granted to a parish priest the permission to specify any confessor, it was not necessary to specify expressly the number of priests so authorised.³⁰ Since

²⁷ Ibid., §§ Utque praeterea and Dum autem huiusmodi.

²⁸ Ferraris: *Bibliotheca Prompt*, art Indulgentia, VI, §52.

²⁹ S.C. Ind. Vindana, Sept. 20th, 1775.

³⁰ Cf. *Decreta Authentica*, S.C. Indul. 440, quoted by Beringer-Steinen, §1023.

that time bishops could, if they thought fit, subdelegate all the confessors of the diocese.

At present priests attending the sick have power to give the blessing and indulgence not by subdelegation from the bishop but from the common law of the Church. Already before the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law in 1917, the Holy See empowered certain priests to give it. Thus by letter of the Cardinal Secretary of State to Cardinal Van Rossum, March 16th, 1915, all the military chaplains and soldier priests of certain countries were delegated by the Pope; later by decree of the Holy Office, December 16th, 1915, the power was extended to the chaplains and soldier priests of all the warring nations.³¹ Also it was possible for priests to obtain the faculty through the Penitentiary, and usually for seven years.³² The Code of Benedict XV crowned the work of Benedict XIV; the blessing was brought within the reach of practically all the dying; by it all priests attending the sick, even though not otherwise approved for confessions, were authorized, and not only authorized but commanded, to give the blessing. "A parish priest or other priest who assists the sick has the faculty of imparting the apostolic blessing with the plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis*, which blessing must not be omitted."³³

In order to impart the blessing validly it is necessary to use the prescribed form. Up to 1726 no special form was laid down; in that year Benedict XIII drew up certain prayers which were to be used. In 1747 Benedict XIV prepared a more suitable form, which he appended to the Bull, *Pia Mater*, and commanded to be used.³⁴ This was to be used in its entirety in cases where there was no need of dispatch. Cases would occur, however, in which death would be too near for the full form to be used. To meet these cases the rubric of the Bull allowed the blessing to be given without the preliminary prayers. Opinions differed as to what constituted the blessing; Catalanus considered the last sentence of the form suffi-

³¹ Cf. *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, March 15th, 1919.

³² Beringer-Steinen, §1024.

³³ Can. 468, §2.

³⁴ *Pia Mater*, § Pro impertienda, etc.

cient—*Benedicat te*, etc.;³⁵ Cavalieri, *Ego facultate*, etc.³⁶ In course of time the rubric was made more explicit. By 1843 the Breviary stated that in cases of urgency it was sufficient to begin at : *Dominus noster Jesus Christus*; but if death was too near for this, the priest was to recite, *Indulgentiam plenariam*, etc. This is the rubric as given in the English Ritual of 1915. In 1922 the Congregation of Rites clarified matters still more. Three contingencies were considered : (1) Where there is no time to say the Confiteor and prayers; in this case the blessing was to begin at *Dominus noster*. (2) Where death is too near to recite the *Dominus noster*, etc.; here it would be sufficient to say, *Ego, facultate*, etc., *Per sacrosancta*, etc., *Benedicat te*, etc. (3) Where there is more urgent case of necessity—in *casu vero necessitatis*; here the form to be used would be : “ Ego, facultate mihi ab Apostolica Sede tributa, indulgentiam plenariam et remissionem omnium peccatorum tibi concedo, et benedico te in nomine Patris,” etc.³⁷ In 1925 a new typical edition of the Roman Ritual was approved by special Decree of Pius XI of June 10th, 1925, and published by the Vatican Press. In this Ritual are given the definite rubrics now in force regarding the Apostolic Blessing; these are based on the decree of S.C. Rites of August 9th, 1922, but differ in some respects. Two contingencies only are considered : (1) Where there is no time for the Confiteor and preliminary prayers; in this case the form is : *Ego facultate*, etc. *Per sacrosancta*, etc. *Benedicat te*, etc. (2) *In casu vero necessitatis*; here the form is : “ Ego, facultate mihi ab Apostolica Sede tributa, indulgentiam plenariam et remissionem omnium peccatorum tibi concedo, et benedico te in nomine Patris,” etc.

This form as given in the approved liturgical books must be used for validity. Asked whether a priest, who through lack of a book omitted the *Pia Mater* form, would validly impart the indulgence, the Congregation of Indulgences replied : “ No, because the form is not merely directive but preceptive.”³⁸ It is preceptive, no matter on what title the indulgence is imparted by a priest nor

³⁵ Comm. in *Rit. Rom.*, 5, 6, §7.

³⁶ Cf. O’Kane *loc. cit.*, §976.

³⁷ S.R.C., Aug. 9th, 1922.

³⁸ S.C. Ind., Feb. 5th, 1841.

by whom it is given. In answer to a question relating to the Third Order of St. Francis, the same Congregation replied: "The form of Benedict XIV is to be prescribed under pain of nullity, for all indiscriminately."³⁹ This answer did not refer merely to the Third Order of St. Francis, for the Congregation inserted the decree, almost verbatim, in its official *Raccolta* of 1886 and 1898. Acting on this decree and on the Brief, *Quo Universi*, of Leo XIII, the Congregation of Rites expunged from the typical edition of the Roman Ritual of 1884 all except the *Pia Mater* formula.

Further, for certain validity the Latin form must be used. Questioned on this point the Congregation of Rites answered that the blessing, being a strictly liturgical prayer, could not be given in the vernacular.⁴⁰ It must be noted that this decree, though published in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* of 1906, is omitted in the latest edition of the *Decreta Authentica*, and so cannot be adduced as conclusive.

Besides the use of the valid form by the priest, it is necessary that the recipient of the blessing be properly disposed and fulfil the requisite conditions; otherwise the oft-quoted words of Navarrus will be verified: "Contingit ut quis confiteatur aut moriatur bullis plenus et vacuus indulgentiis." As is usual in all indulgences, there must be the requisite intention and the state of grace. In addition there are required the invocation of the Holy Name and resignation to death.

1. *Requisite Intention.* Theologians have held that *per se* no intention is required for the gaining of an indulgence.⁴¹ However this may be, it is certain that by the law of the Church a general intention of gaining the indulgence is required.⁴² Ordinarily at least an habitual intention is required; "such an intention consists in an act of the will once made and never since retracted, yet not adverted to at the time of reception and in no way

³⁹ S.C. Ind., March 18th, 1879.

⁴⁰ S.C.R., June 3rd, 1904.

⁴¹ Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri, *Opus Theologicum Morale*, vol. 5, p. 635 (edit. 1892).

⁴² Can. 925, §2.

flowing into or determining the act of the recipient."⁴³ An implicit habitual intention suffices, that is, an intention contained in some action with which the will of not gaining the indulgence cannot accord.⁴⁴ With regard to the Indulgence *in articulo mortis*, some, relying on the words of the rubric, *seu verisimiliter petiissent*, hold that an interpretative intention is sufficient.⁴⁵ All that these words, however, seem to suggest is that an interpretative petition is sufficient. The necessity of an implicit habitual intention is quite consistent with the sufficiency of an interpretative petition.

2. *State of Grace.* To obtain the benefit of any indulgence it is necessary that a person be in the state of grace, at least at the end of the prescribed works.⁴⁶ To ensure the state of grace at the time the application of the indulgence is made, Benedict XIV commands priests who impart the blessing to urge the recipient to renewed acts of sorrow for sin and love of God;⁴⁷ and the rubric of the blessing says: "If the sick person wishes to confess, hear and absolve him; if he does not petition confession, excite him to elicit an act of contrition."⁴⁸ If the person is in mortal sin when the blessing is imparted, O'Kane holds that the blessing is of no avail and should be repeated when he recovers the state of grace;⁴⁹ this, however, is incorrect. The blessing takes effect, not at the time of application, but when the last breath is drawn; and if at that moment a person, who had received the blessing in a state of sin, were by an act of contrition or by absolution to regain the state of grace, the effect of the blessing would be obtained. This is borne out by the decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, which forbids the repetition of the blessing, where it has been imparted while the subject was in a state of sin."⁵⁰

⁴³ Cf. Kilker: *Extreme Unction*, p. 253; Cappello: *De Sacramentis*, vol. II, §966.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Cf. Fanfani: *De Indulgentiis*, §32, B.

⁴⁶ Can. 925, §1.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Pia Mater*, § Et quoniam sacerdotibus.

⁴⁸ *Rit. Rom.*, 5, 6, §3.

⁴⁹ *Rubrics of Rom. Ritual*, §963; Cf. also De Herdt, III, §309.

⁵⁰ S.C. Ind., June 20th, 1836; Cf. Beringer-Steinen, §1029: Fanfari, §94, 6.

3. *Invocation of the Holy Name.* The invocation of the Holy Name, at least mentally, is a *conditio sine qua non* for the gaining of this indulgence. Formerly differing opinions were held on this point, from the fact that in the *Pia Mater* form no mention was made of it. It is worthy of note that in 1772 Clement XIV, besides granting in perpetuity to superiors in missionary countries the faculty of granting the indulgence with the *Pia Mater* form, granted another plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis* to those of their subjects who should die without the sacraments and without the assistance of the priest; this indulgence could be gained by invoking the Holy Name and being resigned to death.⁵¹ One might have expected that had the Holy Name been necessary in the Apostolic Blessing, Clement would have mentioned it. In 1775 a doubt was laid before the Congregation of Indulgences; in the briefs authorizing bishops to impart the blessing mention was made of the invocation; it was asked whether this was prescribed as a *conditio sine qua non* of gaining the indulgence; the Congregation replied in the affirmative.⁵² Again, in 1892 the same Congregation, in answer to the Archbishop of Dublin, stated: "The invocation, at least mental, of the Holy Name is a *conditio sine qua non* for all the faithful who wish to gain the plenary indulgence."⁵³ The typical edition of 1925 of the *Roman Ritual* incorporates this point in the rubrics of the blessing; "tum instruat, atque hortetur, ut sanctissimum nomen *Jesu*, corde saltem, invocet," etc.⁵⁴

4. *Resignation to Death.* In order that a person may be prepared and disposed to obtain the fruit of the indulgence, Benedict XIV insists on resignation to death: "Hoc enim praecipue opus in huiusmodi articulo constitutis imponimus et iniungimus, quo se ad Plenariae Indulgentiae fructum consequendum praeparent, atque disponant."⁵⁵ The question arises as to what kind of resignation is required. Is it sufficient that the subject be in

⁵¹ Cong. de Prop. Fide, April 5th, 1772; Cf. Ferraris: *Bibliotheca Prompta*, Indulgentia, §52.

⁵² S.C. Ind., Vindana, ad 7m, Sept. 20th, 1775.

⁵³ S.C. Ind., Sept. 22nd, 1892.

⁵⁴ *Rit. Rom.*, 5, 6, §3; Cf. also 5, 5, §2.

⁵⁵ *Pia Mater*, § Et quoniam.

such a state of mind as to will in general all that God wills, or must he be actually resigned to death in particular? Various considerations would seem to point to the view that generic resignation is not sufficient. There are the careful instructions of liturgists and theologians. "It is the duty of the priest to direct the attention of the sick person to this subject, viz. the acceptance of sufferings and death itself from God. But it is not necessary, and often not suitable, to do this when giving the blessing, or in the presence of others. There are many sick, especially in our day, whose state demands all manner of tact. It is best to do this duty during Confession or when one is alone with the dying person."⁵⁶ "The priest must be circumspect, lest, in exhorting the sick person to acceptance of death in satisfaction for sin, he offend him or incur his indignation or that of the bystanders. Hence, if difficulty is foreseen, it is advisable to exhort him in Confession or in the absence of others to submit patiently to death."⁵⁷ "Prudence will dictate to the priest the time and manner of speaking to the patient, and of placing him in this disposition. As a rule, the best time will be during Confession, when the priest is alone with the penitent."⁵⁸ Exhortation to resignation in general to God's will does not seem to demand such a display of tact.

The words of Benedict XIV seem to confirm this view. His whole purpose in *Pia Mater* is to give as many as possible the benefit of the indulgence. One would therefore reasonably judge that he would content himself with prescribing generic resignation, if that were all required. Yet in the Bull he does not mention such resignation—he definitely specifies resignation to death—"praesertim vero ad ipsam mortem aequo ac libenti animo de manu Domini suscipiendam." Nor does he merely mention death; he dwells on the point. Taking a lead from St. Augustine he emphasises the value of resignation to death: death ever remains a punishment, though, borne piously, it increases the merit of patience; it is the punishment of all born to this world, but also the glory of the

⁵⁶ Beringer-Steinen, *l.c.*, §1027.

⁵⁷ Konings: *Theol. Moralis*, §1800.

⁵⁸ Dunne: *The Ritual Explained*, p. 91; Cf. also Marc, *Theol. Moralis*, §1742.

reborn; it is the retribution of sin, yet sometimes brings it about that there is no retribution of sin.⁵⁹ The fact of his dwelling on this point would seem to suggest his desire for actual resignation to death.

The words of the rubric seem to leave no room for doubt. "Let the priest instruct and exhort him (the sick person) freely to submit to the trials and sorrows of sickness in expiation of his past life, and to offer himself to God prepared to accept whatever it pleases Him, and patiently to accept of death itself in satisfaction for the punishment of sin."⁶⁰ Here, first of all, general resignation to God's will is inculcated. Why proceed to mention death, if all that is required is general resignation? And why emphasise death—"death itself"—*mortem ipsam*?

With regard to the subject of the blessing, it can be briefly stated that it can be imparted to all in danger of death, who are or have been capable of sacramental absolution, and have not received the Blessing in the same state of illness. For its validity it is not necessary that it be imparted when death is almost at hand. Some indeed have considered this necessary, or at least the safest view. In imparting the blessing they considered it safest to await, if possible, the coming of death. Their view rested on the description of the blessing as *Benedictio in articulo mortis* or *pro extremo momento*; the Congregation of Indulgences, April 23rd, 1675, declared that the indulgence was gained only in the real, not presumed, article of death. They applied to the imparting of the indulgence this answer, which referred to the gaining of it.⁶¹ The Holy Office, January 27th, 1780, dealing with a question concerning missionaries, decided that there was no need to await the coming of death, and in

⁵⁹ *Pia Mater*, § Et quoniam; Cf. *De Civitate Dei*, 13, 6: "Quidquid tamen illud est in morientibus, quod cum gravi sensu adimit sensum, pie fideliterque tolerando, auget meritum patientiae, non aufert vocabulum poenae. Ita cum ex hominis primi perpetuata propagine procul dubio sit mors poena nascentis; tamen, si proprietate, iustitiaeque pendatur, fit gloria renascentis; et cum sit mors peccati retributio, aliquando impetrat, ut nihil retribuatur peccato."

⁶⁰ *Rit. Rom.*, 5, 6, §3.

⁶¹ Cf. *De Herdt*, III, §308, 1°; *Beringer-Steinen*, §1029.

1885, the Congregation of Indulgences, by decree of December 18th, settled the question for all. Asked whether it was permitted to give the blessing soon after the sacraments of the dying, even when the danger of death was not yet imminent, it replied in the affirmative, and added: "This reply, from the nature of the case, holds good for all the sick faithful in danger of death." In practice therefore one is safe in imparting the blessing in such a sickness as allows the administration of Extreme Unction or Viaticum.⁶³ It is not necessary that the danger arise from sickness. True the Bull *Pia Mater* and the rubrics speak of the subject as *infirmus, aegrotus*. These words, however, simply describe the case that usually occurs. The blessing can be given to all in danger of death, whether from sickness, battle or any other cause.⁶⁴ The Congregation of Propaganda definitely lays down that it can be given to those condemned to death, at the time of execution or on the day of execution.⁶⁵

It can be imparted to all who have been, or are, capable of absolution. At one time it was doubted whether children who had come to the use of reason but had not made their First Communion could be subjects of the indulgence; one cause of the doubt was the view that Holy Communion was one of the conditions for gaining it. Arguing from the words of *Pia Mater*, one would say there was no foundation for the doubt. Holy Communion is nowhere prescribed as a necessary preliminary. The Pope speaks of his care for *omnes Ecclesiae filii*—not merely adults—*moribundos fideles, Catholicae Religionis professoribus*, without placing expressly any limitation.⁶⁶ The Congregation of Rites in 1826 solved the doubt; asked whether children who had not made their First Communion could receive the blessing and indulgence it replied in the affirmative.⁶⁷ The same decision was given by the Congregation of Indulgences, July 9th, 1832: "An conveniat et an necessarium sit, seu expediat, dare benedictionem apostolicam in articulo mortis pueris nondum communicantibus, seu qui ob rationes fundatas

⁶³ Cf. Beringer-Steinen, §1029; Fanfani, §92.

⁶⁴ Cf. Dunne, *l.c.*, p. 91; Fanfani, §92.

⁶⁵ S.C. Prop. Fide, Aug. 10th, 1841.

⁶⁶ Cf. Gardellini's note on Decree 2650, of S.C.R.

⁶⁷ C.C.R., Dec. 16th, 1826.

hactenus ad primam Communionem admissi non sunt et iam admitti adhuc non possunt? R. 1° An conveniat seu expediat, etc. . . . : affirmative, dummodo pueri sint rationis capaces. 2° An sit necessarium, utrum scilicet benedictio, de qua agitur, ut necessitas medii necne habenda sit : negative. Haec est theologorum sententia." The only Catholics to whom it is to be refused are those who have not come to the use of reason, and those who are excommunicated or dying in manifest impenitence.⁶⁷

It must not be imparted more than once in the same state of illness. It has its effect only at the time of death, no matter when imparted. Hence, strictly speaking, it does not need repeating during life. However, the Church in certain circumstances allows its repetition, in order to prevent uncertainty and doubt and to console the sick.⁶⁸ No matter how protracted an illness may be, repetition is forbidden. If a person recovers, and falls into a new danger, repetition is allowed. "An Benedictio apostolica pluries impertiri possit novo mortis periculo redeunte? Resp. Negative, permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna; affirmative vero, si infirmus convaluerit, ac deinde quacumque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat."⁶⁹ It may be that the sick person is entitled to the blessing on various heads—as being a member of a Third Order or other confraternity; or he may be visited by various priests each with special and distinct faculties; even in such cases the blessing can be imparted once only in one sickness.⁷⁰ This, however, does not mean that the patient may not try to gain other indulgences for the moment of death, for example, by repeating the act of resignation to death, or by using the Happy Death crucifix.

In imparting the blessing care must be taken to follow *ad amussim*, as far as possible, the rubrics and prayers of the Ritual. Whether in the case of indulgences there is room for probabilities may be an open question; certain theologians rule it out—*non probabilitas sed veritas*

⁶⁷ *Rit. Rom.*, 5, 6, 1.

⁶⁸ Beringer-Steinen, §1030.

⁶⁹ *S.C. Ind.*, Sept. 24th, 1838.

⁷⁰ Cf. *S.C. Ind.*, Feb. 5th, 1841; *S.C. Ind.*, Mar. 12th, 1855; June 12th, 1884.

*effectum producit.*⁷¹ Others hold that the Church will supply for any defects due to the use of a probable opinion.⁷² However that may be, when one considers the questions submitted to the Congregations of Rites and of Indulgences, and when one considers the meticulous solutions given to the questions which may appear small matters, one is driven to the conclusion that the smallest rubric should be obeyed.

⁷¹ Cf. Gury, II, §1055; St. Alphonsus, 6, 4, 4, 2, §12; Fanfani, §33. De Herdt, III, §308, 1°.

⁷² Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri, vol. 5, p. 637; Cappello, II, §978.

"MEN OF LITTLE SHOWING"

(5) MGR. WILLIAM WRENNALL,

President of Ushaw, 1878 to 1885

By THE REV. R. BILSBORROW, P.P., of Weld Bank, Chorley

THE title of this series of articles makes it possible to include without apology a brief sketch of the Rt. Rev. Mgr. William Wrennall, ninth President of Ushaw. "A great man," said his panegyrist, "I will not call him; a great *soul* he was and is." Had one been asked to choose the greatest of Ushaw's Presidents, the choice would inevitably have fallen upon Charles Newsham; but the very magnitude of his achievements automatically disqualifies him from inclusion in a gallery of portraits representing "men of little showing." So for the purpose of this paper William Wrennall will best serve.

His was not an overwhelming, nor even a dominant personality; he was not startlingly dynamic; yet he possessed a fundamental and well-directed strength that enabled him to leave a deep impress on his time and to do a work that will endure. To William Wrennall as perhaps to no other it was given to contribute in a remarkable way to the formation of that somewhat mysterious and well-nigh indefinable thing we call a "spirit"—that equipment of ideals and co-ordination of aims which influence men's lives and give consistency to character. If Ushaw has a "spirit," then William Wrennall is its embodiment and type. He may be taken as the authentic representative of his *alma mater*, as well as an epitome of her history. The period in which he lived, together with his long association with the college, conspired to make him a repository of her traditions and an exemplar of her life.

The span of his years stretched from 1819 to 1907. When William Wrennall was born, Catholic England had not yet emerged from the shadow of penal times; Emancipation was still a thing of the future, and the régime of the Vicars Apostolic was to last for another thirty years. The exodus of the refugee students from Douai was an

event of the not distant past, and young Wrennall knew men who had taken part in the northern section of the migration after refusal to share the lot of those who halted at Old Hall. Their wanderings found short respite in sojourns at Tudhoe and Pontop and Crook Hall, till at last, in 1808, they took up residence in the newly-built college of Ushaw.

These were momentous events to the Catholics of England, for to them it meant that Douai and all it stood for—Douai, the hope and the fortress of the Faith of England, Douai that had been in exile for two hundred years, had come home. It was felt that the Faith in England, if not yet safe, was becoming safer. The full light was not yet, but the dawn was at hand; and men's pulses stirred at the thought.

It was to events such as these or their sequel that William Wrennall found himself introduced—a state of hope, of necessary transition and of anxious building up. It was realized both by the clergy and the laity of the time that the key of the Catholic position in England which had been in the hands of Douai was now jointly held by Douai's successors—Old Hall in the South, Ushaw in the North. But this was not all. So great had been the esteem and reverence in which Douai was held that it was unthinkable that Douai should be allowed to die. It must somehow survive and be always what it had been. Hence the founders both of Ushaw and Old Hall deliberately designed that their ventures should be regarded not as the beginning of a new life but as a continuance of the old. It was to be a transplantation—the prolongation of the same life in a different setting—and not the striking of a new stock. They did not visualize Old Hall and Ushaw as *representing* Douai; they *were* Douai. What they desired was not similarity, but identity. The beacon of Douai was still the light to which men looked for guidance, and whether in France or at home the fire must not fail.

This digression into the history of the beginnings of the Catholic Revival may be pardoned on the grounds that the facts here briefly recorded are not alien to the subject of this sketch; indeed they may be said to be essential to the right understanding of the training, the aims and the character of William Wrennall, for the man was in a true

sense the creation of his time as well as a reflex of its needs and purpose.

When William Wrennall entered Ushaw in 1834 as a boy of fifteen he found the College steeped in the traditions of Douai, and it can be claimed that he lived in an atmosphere of Douai all his life. The curriculum, the methods, the times of study and recreation, the rules and, above all, the general tone and spirit of the place, were all pure Douai. The training was of the same quality as that which had fitted men more than a century earlier to enter England in peril of liberty and life. It seemed as though, in spite of the altered circumstances of the last thirty years, the authorities were *afraid* of any relaxation, any lowering of the standard of severity. The admission of what to them savoured of luxury and pampering would have been not only disloyalty but high treason against Douai. As an old man Mgr. Wrennall would recount how if one of the students of the early days being minded to secure exemption from some restriction, approached a Superior and asked why a particular prohibition existed, he was invariably met by the crushing rejoinder, "It was so at Douai." Against this there was no appeal. In those days what Douai said, *went*. It is to be suspected that the sacred name of Douai was used as sponsor at the introduction of many an unpopular measure, and it is safe to guess that some of the students did not love Douai more than was good for them. The very name was a spell-binder.

Such was the Ushaw of young William Wrennall's time. Undeniably, judged by the standards of to-day, the life there was a hard one, but this resulted as much from choice and on principle as from necessity. Funds were scarce, it is true, but even had they been plentiful it is doubtful if they would have expressed themselves in terms of luxurious living. Men were being trained to lead a hard life, and the only way to effect this was to inure them to hardship.

Simplicity, rigour, self-denial almost to the point of privation; these were the lines on which it was considered essential that the training of that time should be conducted. And who shall say that such methods were not justified by results? Mgr. Wrennall used to recall that in the early thirties at Ushaw there were not more than three or four rooms in the whole House that were

furnished with carpets; and he was fond of relating an incident which has about it the Spartan touch. One day in drear November as the President was walking along the front corridor he noticed a boy huddled in one of the window seats. The President stopped and asked what ailed him. The boy answered, "Sir, I am very cold, and there is no fire in the playroom." The old man looked at him for a few moments in silence and then said, "Go up to my room and warm yourself by *my* fire." Gleefully the young fellow scampered off to the President's room and opened the door, to find—an empty grate.

But let it not be supposed because discipline was firm and self-denial expected and enforced, that an air of gloom and suppression pervaded the place. It is open to belief that the high spirits of that time were higher, and expressed themselves more robustly than in the days of our own more complex civilization. Pity therefore would not only be misplaced: it were an impertinence. "Those were the days," said the old Monsignor when speaking of his happy youth.

Hard work too went hand in hand with strict living, and the work was seldom interrupted. Breaks at Christmas and Easter were unheard of, and midsummer vacations few and far between. William Wrennall went home twice in his ten years' course—a fair average for that time. Those who stayed at Ushaw for the vacation continued their studies much as usual. Their reading of the classics was prodigious and their grasp of the intricacies of mathematics uncanny. Like most of his contemporaries, Mgr. Wrennall could to the end of his life cap a remark or clinch an argument by an apt quotation from Horace or Ovid or Virgil, and science and figures held few secrets from him. We need not suppose that either he or his fellows were unusually gifted; in his case at least the result was achieved by unremitting application. When in the School of Low Philosophy, William Wrennall and five others were told that they must present themselves in May to sit for the B.A. examination. There were six months in which to prepare and the whole course to be traversed. Here was a task to be grappled with, and they proved themselves men of grit and resource. They rose at 4 o'clock and put in an hour's mathematics before Meditation. All six passed, William Wrennall being one of four to obtain a first class degree. "I've been on the

stretch all my life," the Monsignor used to say, "and I've never quite caught up." If he never caught up, at least the pursuit never ended, and he was hot on the trail still when he died. He did not know how to be idle, and whether this resulted from a native industry or from a fear of sloth one can only conjecture; but it is certain that he filled all his hours, and yet found time for everything in season. And there was method and precision and thoroughness about all he did. What he started he saw through, and he had a contempt for the ways of the dilettante and the trifler. The exhortation *age quod agis*, which he heard at his ordination, might have been adopted by him as the motto of his life.

So far we have spoken but of the equipment of the natural man—the outlook, the surroundings, the physical and mental training, which contribute to the development and fixing of the human element in a man's character. These things, however, are but the foundation. They are vital, it is true, because they determine the strength and the extent of the superstructure—they make possible the after building. But it is the supernatural that stands above and completes the edifice. From the foundations and ground plan a man of vision may deduce the towering top; so too men might guess from such foundations that William Wrennall could build well and high. He had dug deeply, had cut the first stones wide and set them firmly so that no matter what was raised above there could be no subsidence, nor need he fear collapse either from lateral thrust within or wind-pressure without. The foundations of William Wrennall's character may not have been spacious, indeed they were not on the grand scale, but they lacked nothing in solidity, and on them he proceeded to build. William Wrennall, the man, was not big, but William Wrennall, the man of God, was imposing; and it was this latter that influenced deeply the lives of two and three generations of priests and laymen in the North of England and further afield. Without the physical advantages of either health or stature, incapable of athletic prowess, insignificant in a crowd, denied conspicuous grace of person, lacking the magnetism of oratory or the sparkle of wit; in spite of these natural handicaps he was for sixty years one of the men who counted for much, one of the men who radiated beneficent power. For most of this time his sphere was confined to the College, and it was here his sway was

most felt. This is not apparent from the mere summary of his academic career. He filled successively the posts of Prefect of Discipline, Professor of Mathematics, of Natural Philosophy, Vice-President, and at length, from 1878 to 1885, he ruled the college as President. But it was not in his character as professor nor yet as ruler that his triumphs lay. As lecturer he was painstaking and efficient rather than brilliant, as President he can never rank either with Newsham or Tate.

What was then the secret of his strength? The answer can be given in one word: Spirituality. Measured intellectually, Ushaw has had many greater sons, but it may be doubted if she has ever had a holier than William Wrennall.

It looks as though from the first he carefully planned to make his soul "capable of the crops of God" by removal of all hindrances to grace, so that God could have His way with him. The process of preparation was along orthodox lines. He had a profound distrust of unregenerate nature, and therefore if he were not to suffer from the discords of dual control this nature must be put in harness and made to serve. With an energy and pertinacity that were peculiarly his own he set about a systematic and comprehensive course of training in self-discipline that was to last his life time. He early recognized that there was no way to sanctity or even to spiritual security except by the road of self-conquest, and his aim was to achieve the highest possible degree of safety for unstable nature. In pursuance of this object the mere avoidance of self-indulgence did not seem sufficient. This to him represented but the negative side of the process; the positive was still to be added, and consisted in the deliberate introduction of voluntary penance. He was not content with what came; he must go further than this, so he went out of his way to look for it. Penance thus came to him not haphazard but by regulation. It was only by the invigorating tonic of self-discipline, he thought, that a man could be braced up to resist what he sometimes spoke of as "the moral disintegration of middle age." In this watchful distrust of self not only was there to be no taking off the bridle, but seldom a relaxing of the curb. Such views he held firmly and put into practice so thoroughly that long before the end he had schooled himself to a degree almost

incredible and had attained a self-mastery well nigh complete. In devising methods by which to keep himself mortified he sometimes displayed an ingenuity that was touching almost to tears. One example will suffice. During the last four weeks of his life the old man was too feeble to leave his bed. He was then in charge of a nursing Sister from Gunnersbury, who provided a hand-bell for the table by his bedside, that he might call her when required. But the dying man found another and a better use for the bell than summoning assistance. Secretly he would put it in the bed and lie upon it; and after death his back and shoulders were found to be livid with bruises shaped with the imprint of the bell.

Side by side with the love of penance there developed in him a passionate love of prayer. With him prayer became not merely an occasional incident but the chief—nearly the sole—occupation of his life. God's presence so encompassed and gripped him that he seemed never unaware. The regularity, the intensity and the duration of his official devotions left an impression both at Ushaw and afterwards at Wesham and Hornby, that is vivid still. But his official devotions were only the public beginnings of his prayers; their uninterrupted continuance was a private matter between God and himself, at most to be dimly surmised by others.

Here was a "man of little showing" indeed, for he chose the hidden way. Not for him to tread the "paths of Glory," nor yet to command "the loud world's clapping hands." Pomp was repugnant to him; praise made him wince. All he craved was to be left in obscurity so that he might lead his own inner life unrecognized. Such force then as he wielded was the force of example, the unconscious power of a disciplined spirit. His strength was occult and his greatest conquests secret even from himself.

Among those who knew him intimately it would probably be agreed that the monumental work of Mgr. Wrennall was wrought in the secrecy of the confessional. There was about him some of the indefinable attraction of holiness which made men in doubt or difficulty gravitate towards him as steel to the magnet. They recognized in him the wisdom of the specialist and the skill of the master physician, who begot confidence while disarming fear. As a director of souls he displayed a

spiritual discernment and discretion that were little short of genius. Tender towards frailty, he was heavy upon anything that flavoured of insincerity or presumption or flippancy. To him a sin was a sin, and though you might tone it down by calling it a slip or an adventure or an escapade, he knew it for what it was. His idea of the Sacrament of Penance was that though it dealt largely with mercy it had yet something to do with punishment. He sat in the seat of judgment to dispense forgiveness, it is true, but not merely to issue scot-free pardons at sight. Those, therefore, who went to him expecting a "reduction for quantity" were in danger of a shock. A story—a true one—is told to illustrate this. An old priest living in a rural part of Lancashire had obtained Mgr. Wrennall's acceptance of an invitation to spend a week with him during the midsummer holidays. On the Sunday before his guest arrived the priest announced to his flock that on the following Saturday Mgr. Wrennall would hear confessions, and expressed a hope that those who abstained from the Sacrament through dislike of being recognized by their own priest would take advantage of the presence of a stranger. When Saturday came it was noticed that there had turned up for the "vestry" two bucolic disciples of Bacchus whose visits to the neighbouring market town invariably ended in carousals. The first one went jauntily into the box, almost with a swagger, hoping no doubt to get off lightly with this stranger, and with a minimum of detail. In twenty minutes he emerged, crumpled. The next one rose to take his place. As they met he paused and asked the shriven one with deep concern, and in a whisper that could be heard throughout the chapel: "What's he like?" The reply came with intense conviction and in a voice that was a subdued roar: "He fair bottoms it."

Let it not be supposed that this was his habitual method; he employed it only when occasion demanded, and for the rest he was gentle, full of sympathy born of knowledge and guided by an insight that is the special gift of interior men.

His was the confessional to which students and priests flocked, and thanked God for it all their days. For the rôle of spiritual guide to the clergy-to-be, or in being, he was singularly well qualified, for he brought to the task the rich resources of a mind and soul saturated with the

wisdom of God. He felt keenly the heavy responsibility such a duty imposed, for so high was his conception of the dignity of the priestly character that it frightened him. The sanctity and power of the priesthood never became stale to him, but staggered him daily with fresh wonder. The big thing in his life was the fact that he was a priest, and the marvel was as new to him at the end as on his ordination day. The grace of the Sacrament of Orders had so wrought in him, natural and supernatural had so mingled, that the man was transformed by the sacerdotal seal, and there resulted a just blend of the human and the divine—an *alter Christus*.

At length the time came when he felt his work at Ushaw was done, and he begged to be relieved of the Presidency. The work of governance had never been congenial, but for seven years he stood manfully by the helm and piloted the College through a difficult and anxious period till he brought it to smooth waters. The manner of his going forth was characteristic and his own choice. He wandered out quietly through the kitchen exit as though for a stroll in the country, and not half a dozen people in the House knew he had gone. Thus without pyrotechnics was the pilot dropped.

And so at the age of sixty-six Mgr. Wrennall began life anew. It might be thought that at such an age he had done his work and earned his rest; but such fires burned in him as age could not quench. The ending of one career was but the occasion of beginning another. Into the unaccustomed work of a missionary priest he threw himself with all the fresh enthusiasm of a neophyte and toiled on unceasingly and with amazing success for another twenty-two years—first at Wesham, and finally at Hornby in Lonsdale, where Lingard had lived and laboured. And wherever he went men counted his presence amongst them as a benediction, for everywhere he shed the radiancy of a soul that is "arm-fellow of God." To live with him any time during his last forty years was to be a witness of something like sanctity in action. And ever as the end drew near he increased his efforts, so that death should find him with all his harvest reaped. Some months before he died it became evident that the burden of saying Office was more than he could sustain. It occupied him hours daily, for failing sight and the lethargy of age were upon him; but he clung to

the practice with a tenacity that was pathetic. The priest who was with him remonstrated, pointing out that the exertion was sapping his dwindling energies and doing positive injury. "Put me under obedience then," he pleaded, after some thought, and his meaning was clear. If he could not enjoy the consolation and reward of the prayers so dear to him, at least he would wring some compensation from the merit of submitting to another's will. Once he was found lying prostrate on his face in front of the altar, where he had fallen when striving to genuflect. He had been in that position, it appeared, for over an hour, being quite unable to rise or even to turn upon his back; and there he waited till help came. Afterwards the assistant priest expressed concern to the old man that he had been compelled to lie in that position for so long. He replied with a flash of the old half-humorous spirit: "I couldn't lie in a better place; and I hope the time wasn't wasted!" Wasted by such a man, such an opportunity never could be: and there are those who would find no difficulty in believing that a special reward is reserved for the hour the stricken man spent on his face before the tabernacle.

In the seclusion of Hornby he went out, leaving behind him for legacy the memory and the fragrance of a blameless life. And there are men living still, scattered not only throughout these islands, but from Bombay to the Cape, and on to distant California, who remember and bless God for the gift of William Wrennall.

NOTE.—The writer begs to offer humble apologies to the editor of the "Ushaw Magazine" for extensive pilferings from an article in that periodical which appeared in 1908. The only plea he can advance in defense of the charge of plagiarism is that both the articles are from the same pen, and that, as in the first sketch, he outlined most of the chief features of Mgr. Wrennall with which he was familiar, it was inevitable that in the second there should be some general repetition and overlapping.

INDEFINITE GOD IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

BY THE REV. ARTHUR L. REYS.

"SCHOLASTIC theology makes God manlike; Christian Science makes man Godlike." In these words Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of "Christian Science," summarises what she conceives to be the great contrast between her teaching and that of Historic Christianity. In her "Message to the Mother Church for 1901," from which the above words are taken, she further explains her attitude: "We are not transcendentalists to the extent of extinguishing anything that is real, good, or true; for God and man in divine Science, or the logic of Truth, are coexistent and eternal, and the nature of God must be seen in man, who is His eternal image and likeness. The theological God as a person necessitates a creed to explain His person and nature, whereas God explains Himself in Christian Science." Later she adds: "That God is either inconceivable, or is manlike, is not my sense of Him. In divine Science He is 'altogether lovely,' and consistently conceivable as the personality of infinite Love, infinite Spirit, than whom there is none other." Further: "It only needs the prism of divine Science, which Scholastic theology has obscured, to divide the rays of Truth, and bring out the entire hues of God. The lens of Science magnifies the divine power to human sight; and we see the allness of Spirit, therefore the nothingness of matter."

These quotations do indeed show that there is a radical difference between Catholic theology and the "Science" which Mrs. Eddy regards as Christian, but it is by no means evident that by "making man Godlike," Christian Science has brought to the world a higher conception either of man or of God. On the contrary it would seem that the whole tendency of Mrs. Eddy's teaching is to substitute a theory of an *indefinite* God, who is actually finite, for the doctrine of God as *definite* in His intrinsic Infinitude, as adored in Catholic Faith.

According to the decrees of the Vatican Council: "The Holy Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church believes and confesses that there is one, true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, almighty, eternal,

immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intelligence, in will and in all perfection, who, as being one, sole, absolutely simple and immutable spiritual substance, is to be declared as really and essentially distinct from the world, of supreme beatitude in and from Himself, and ineffably exalted above all things beside Himself which exist or are conceivable."

According to this traditional view God is *definite* and known in the totality of His simple Eternity only in that incommunicable Intelligence which is intrinsic to His Deity.

In order to "make man Godlike" Mrs. Eddy denies that man has a mind of his own, and transfers man into the very Mind of God. "Soul or Spirit signifies Deity and nothing else. There is no finite soul or spirit. Soul or Spirit means only one Mind, and cannot be rendered in the plural" (466).¹ "There can be but one Mind, because there is but one God; and if mortals claimed no other Mind and accepted no other, sin would be unknown. We can have but one Mind, if that one is infinite" (469). "In divine Science, the universe, including man, is spiritual, harmonious, and eternal. Science shows that what is termed *matter* is but the subjective state of what is termed by the author *mortal mind*" (114).

It would seem that though Mrs. Eddy bases everything upon the two propositions "God is Spirit" and "God is All," yet there is a radical defect somewhere, for she has to posit something opposed to this Allness which she calls "mortal mind." We must, however, here pass over that aspect of her system. Suffice it to say that in order to dispose of all appearances contrary to her postulates she first relegates them to "mortal mind," and then after reducing mortal mind to "error," she finally dissolves this compound error into "nothingness," and thence feels free to develop her theory of God, Man and Spiritual healing (114, 346).

It is the purport of this article to show that Mrs. Eddy's attempt to achieve a religion entirely spiritual by restricting the meaning of Spirit to Mind, or mental process, and making man an Idea in the one "infinite" Mind, only

¹ The numbers in brackets throughout this article refer to Mrs. Eddy's work *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*, which is the one authorized Text-book of Christian Science.

results in the substitution of the notion of an *indefinite* God for the Catholic doctrine of a definite God. In general Christian Theology the term "infinite" is regarded as negative, and man's knowledge of God is recognised as a very inadequate analogy of the absolute fulness of the All-perfect One. Christian Science, on the contrary, teaches and heals on the supposition that man's knowledge of God is itself infinite, for it is God's own Idea. This explains Mrs. Eddy's assertion that in her view God is "conceivable." "God is infinite, the only Life, substance, Spirit or Soul, the only intelligence of the universe, including man" (330). "The Scriptures imply that God is All-in-all. From this it follows that nothing possesses reality nor existence except the divine Mind and His ideas" (331). "God expresses in man the infinite idea forever developing itself, broadening and rising higher and higher from a boundless basis. Mind manifests all that exists in the infinitude of Truth. We know no more of man as the true divine image and likeness than we know of God" (258).

Here occurs one of the many alternations which characterise Christian Science: Mrs. Eddy unconsciously alternates between two distinct meanings of the phrase "idea of God." At one moment the "idea of God" is *God's idea of man*, while at the next moment the "idea of God" turns into *man's idea of God*. It is also difficult to see how man can have an idea or any knowledge of God, if man has no mind of his own and yet is not identical with the one Mind which is Deity itself. Such is the anomaly of Christian Science. Mrs. Eddy has made man Godlike by calling him an idea of God, but she shrinks from following out her postulate that God, Spirit, is All, by entirely identifying man with God. Hence the dilemma from which there is no escape: Spirit is All yet Spirit is not All, for man is *not* Spirit.

No author has ever made more frequent use of the terms "One" and "Infinite," but we cannot help seeing that at this crucial point of Mrs. Eddy's system her conceptions of both Unity and Infinity break down.

In the oft-recurring sentence, "Nothing exists but God *and* His Ideas," the conjunction "and" hides from Christian Scientists the fatal *compositeness* of Spirit and not-Spirit in God, which denies the doctrine of the unrestricted Oneness of God in Himself. When Catholic

theologians speak of God's knowledge of anything as an "idea," they are careful to add that they make the distinction only from our analogical point of view, while asserting that the ideas of God are identical with His Deity. Thus the Divine Unity is maintained. But in Mrs. Eddy's system this cannot be maintained, for according to her teaching the Ideas of God are *not* identical with Deity, and God and His Idea (man) are represented not, after all, as One but as a duality or composite. "In Christian Science, Spirit, as a proper noun, is the name of the Supreme Being. It means quantity and quality, and applies exclusively to God. The modifying derivatives of the word *spirit* refer only to quality, not to God. Man is spiritual. He is not God, Spirit. If man were Spirit, then men would be spirits, gods" (93).

Thus "God *and* His ideas" means, in Christian Science, God and not-God, man, or: Spirit and not-Spirit. The Allness of Spirit is an illusion, and God has to be regarded as thus Indefinite.

It is in the light of this that we must read the following: "The fundamental propositions of divine metaphysics are summarised in the four following, to me, *self-evident* propositions: 1. God is All-in-all. 2. God is good, God is Mind. 3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter. 4. Life, God, omnipotent good, deny death, evil, sin, disease" (113).

Mrs. Eddy's mind so imperceptibly alternated between phrases which have a superficial resemblance that she quite sincerely wrote here "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter," when her theory required that instead she should have written: "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is man, for man is 'not God, Spirit.'" Thus the meaning of the Unity of God is rendered indefinite in Christian Science, and God is finite except in name.

The conception of God as Indefinite appears equally in Mrs. Eddy's use of the word Infinite. The term infinite is applied everywhere to God as Spirit, yet it is also constantly applied to man who is not God or Spirit. For example: "Immortal man was and is God's image or idea, even the infinite expression of infinite mind, and immortal man is coexistent and coeternal with that Mind. He has been forever in the eternal Mind, God; but infinite Mind can never be in man, but is reflected by

man " (336). There can be no precise meaning in infinity if it can be thus applied alternately to God and to what is not God. It is to be presumed that Mrs. Eddy did not intend to assert that there were two infinities. The explanation of her usage is that she has her own conception of infinity, which is not that of Scholastic Theology. For her, infinity was not definite in itself, but indefinite, an abstraction which was conceived to be a developing process rather than eternally complete. " Even eternity can never reveal the whole of God, since there is no limit to infinitude or to its reflections. " (517). " God expresses in man the infinite idea forever developing itself, broadening and rising higher and higher from its boundless basis " (258). Such equivocal references to infinity and eternity are but the attempted identification of God with our human concepts of indefinite space and time, which are essentially finite. In the strict theological sense it is impossible to suppose that a being can be infinite in some respects without being altogether infinite, or that the " expression " of infinity within the very mind of God can be subject to " development. "

But the conception of God as an indefinite *process* is no accident in Christian Science. It is the foundation of the theory of Health and Divine Healing. Health is man's participation in the Divine process. In view of the doctrine that " religion is entirely spiritual, " which Mrs. Eddy had learned in her Puritan days, we can sympathise with her genuine belief that her doctrine of the Divine Mind as the principle of healing, was a veritable " revelation " from God to His " idea. "

Had her theory been true it would seem strange that it should not have been already obvious to all men, if man infinitely and eternally reflects the Divine Life. But, *ex hypothesi*, we must remember that the Divine expression develops, and indeed the progress has been so slight that one " half " of eternity has passed and " mortal mind " is still predominant, for " The belief that Spirit is finite as well as infinite has darkened all history " (93).

However, Mrs. Eddy fails to maintain that man in general was aware of this part of the truth, and does not assert, as her theory would seem to require, that the healing aspect of God was " self-evident " to all, and

thus she leaves room within the indefinite for the sudden revelation of the forgotten truth of mental healing.

The history of Mrs. Eddy's opinions provides the clue to her system, for it shows that there were two distinct stages in her advancement. First, presumably whilst collaborating with Mr. Phineas P. Quimby, and after experimenting in Medicine and Animal Magnetism she came to the conclusion that all diseases were produced in the body by *mind*, and could be cured by the same mind. At this stage the "mind" to which she attributed these powers was the human mind as ordinarily understood. During that period she was thus developing a psychological theory of the human mind, which represented it as the source of every energy and the controlling factor in all nature and history. Gradually this led her to regard "the real man" as entirely mental, and to identify the *thought process* with Spirit. Regarding this epoch she writes: "My discovery, that erring, mortal, misnamed mind produces all the organism and action of the mortal body, set my thoughts to work in new channels, and led up to my demonstration of the proposition that Mind is All and matter is naught as the leading factor in Mind-science" (109). The word mind was soon to acquire its capital M.

It is important to notice that her original theory was in terms of ordinary human psychology, modelled partly on her Puritan interpretation of St. Paul, which understood the Apostle to teach that man's soul was at war with his body. The real man was the spirit, and her idea of spirit was that of a *quasi-creative process* of thought and imagination. It is to be supposed that at this time also she had acquired her theory of infinity as an indefinite process in space and time.

But originally Mrs. Eddy has no intention to identify the *thought-process* with Infinity, relative either to man or God. She thought of the *human* mind as the mind that heals. But this did not satisfy her as the ultimate principle of Health. "For three years after my discovery, I sought the solution of this problem of Mind-healing, searched the Scriptures and read little else, kept aloof from society, and devoted time and energies to discovering a positive rule. The search was sweet, calm and buoyant with hope, not selfish nor depressing. I

knew the Principle of all harmonious mind-action to be God, and that cures were produced in primitive Christian healing by holy, uplifting faith; but I must know of the Science of this healing, and I won my way to absolute conclusions through divine revelation, reason, and demonstration. The revelation of Truth in the understanding came to me gradually and apparently through divine power " (109).

Later she adds: " The Principle of divine metaphysics is God; the practice of divine metaphysics is the utilization of the power of Truth over error; its rules demonstrate its Science " (111). In a section headed " Mental treatment illustrated " instructions are given: " To prevent disease or to cure it, the power of Truth, of divine Spirit, must break the dream of the material senses. To heal by argument, find the type of the ailment, get its name, and array your mental plea against the physical. Argue at first mentally, not audibly, that the patient has no disease, and confirm the argument so as to destroy the evidence of disease. Mentally insist that harmony is the fact, and that sickness is a temporary dream. Realise the presence of health and the fact of harmonious being, until the body corresponds with the normal conditions of health and harmony " (412). Again: " Maintain the facts of Christian Science—that Spirit is God, and therefore cannot be sick; that what is termed matter cannot be sick; that all causation is Mind, acting through spiritual law " (417).

In this we find Mrs. Eddy's theory of human thought-process imported ready-made into the so-called infinite. And as her meaning of infinity is the indefinite mental evolution of God, it can be " utilised " by the healer who knows its " spiritual law," and can tune-in to its " harmony."

This is something like the " dialectic process " of the Absolute of Hegel, something like the One Substance and its Modes in Spinoza, but is most like the Hindu doctrine of Brahma's emanation, which (like Christian Science) is safeguarded by the theory of Maya or Illusion, to which latter all sensible appearances are relegated. But it is certain, as she herself affirms, that Mrs. Eddy had not read earlier philosophic writings and did not borrow from them. In the West her application of

Monism to healing is her most original feature and that by which posterity will remember her with honour.

Much might be said in respect of Mrs. Eddy's general doctrine of mind-process. It is clear that she never studied the Scholastic theology which she criticises, especially its doctrine that the mind is the animating principle without which the human body would not be an organism at all. She has in view, instead, the comparatively modern theory of the body as mere matter arbitrarily and not vitally related to an independent "mind." As to the meaning of Spirit when applied to God, Scholastic Theology considers it to be an analogy taken from the human spirit as embodying, along with rationality, the powers of all lower "principles of energy" in nature, and thus man's "spiritual" likeness to God is to a God who is not the Exemplar of the thought-process merely, but of the total creation which man's unity exhibits on a lower plane. Spirit, Life, Love and Light are terms equally analogical when applied to God, but Mrs. Eddy prefers to treat all except "light" as adequately representing the nature of Deity, whilst St. John's statement "God is Light" she says "expresses God only in metaphor."

Christian Scientists may be excused for quoting certain doctrinaire Physicists as favouring the view that the universe is entirely Spiritual, but it is surely more correct to say that physical scientists in general find it increasingly impossible to draw dividing lines between man's mind and his organism, or between man's total self and his earthly and cosmic environment. Our consciousness of our composite personality and of our continuity with material nature can never be destroyed.

That "Spirit" is not opposed to the material aspect of our nature, is evidenced by our faculty of language, in which physical and mental operations so wondrously coalesce. Language expresses and communicates spiritual meaning by muscular movements, sounds and signs. Language illustrates the Scholastic view of man as the zenith of compounds. Here is harmony indeed. And Mrs. Eddy admits the present dependence of Christian Science on what she calls "material terms" both for teaching and healing.

Over and above the Providence of God, the healthful resources of our nature itself, the wisdom and dexterity

of the medical profession, and the cheerful determined dispositions of suffering humanity, Christian Science can only add what we may call a Divine delusion. The doctor cannot go as far as the Christian Scientist in persuading the patient that "all is well." He cannot, as a rule, affirm altogether that the disease is non-existent, whereas this counter-illusion as a "last card" can in some cases contribute to a temporary cure. But *the last illness is never cured*, and precisely the same kind of evidence exists to prove eventual death as exists to show that health has ever been restored.

"Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks earnestly, piously and calmly, attains by a gift from God some, and that a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries; partly from the analogy of those things which it naturally knows, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man: but reason never becomes capable of apprehending mysteries as it does those truths which constitute its proper object. For the divine mysteries by their own nature so far transcend the created intelligence that, even when delivered by revelation and received by faith, they remain covered with a veil of faith itself, and shrouded in a certain degree of darkness, so long as we are pilgrims in this mortal life, not yet with God: "for we walk by faith, and not by sight."²

² Vatican Decrees IV.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. R. A. KNOX.

Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost (November 1st).

Gospel. (Matthew ix. 18-26.)

Most preachers will prefer, this year, to make the day's feast, that of All Saints, their subject. There is nothing in the Sunday's Gospel which gives a particularly good opening for a sermon on the feast; these few notes are given for the benefit of those who take the Sunday's Gospel as their text, and treat it as it stands.

Two incidents are related in this Gospel, the healing of the woman with an issue of blood and the raising of Jairus' daughter. The connection between the two is purely chronological; it is worth observing, however, that our Lord interrupts His journey to speak to the woman, although the girl is desperately ill, and actually undergoes physical death, perhaps as the result of the delay. Our Lord seems to rebuke, by this extreme instance, our habit of postponing one work of charity, which lies close to hand, on the ground that we are too busy, being already engaged on another which is more remote—a lesson for the clergy primarily, but one which may well be recommended to the faithful at large.

(1). *The woman with an issue of blood.* This miracle is also recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke. The former adds some details; especially that the woman had spent all her money on treatment by physicians and was none the better for it; St. Luke (since inspiration does not exclude idiosyncrasies on the part of the author) does not follow him here. Both St. Mark and St. Luke describe how our Lord, feeling that *virtue had proceeded from Him*, turned and asked who had touched Him, inviting the *miraculée* to confess her pious boldness; the question, like all our Lord's questions, is plainly designed, not to elicit information, but to gain the confidence of His interlocutor. St. Matthew implies the same order of facts by saying that our Lord *turned and beheld her*. Note that the whole crowd is thronging round Him, so that many touch Him, but only one is healed of an infirmity, because she touches Him with faith, though it be only the hem of His garment. The divine mercy apportions itself to our needs and our consciousness of need, so that even in Holy Communion one soul receives more grace than another; *dat enim Dominus ibi benedictionem suam, ubi vasa vacua invenerit*. Note also that the woman, being unable to monopolize our Lord's attention, *does the best she can* by touching the hem of His garment; so (for example) inability to make frequent use of the Sacraments need not discourage us from being faithful to the sacramentals.

etc. Note also that the woman is healed by reason of the touch, yet our Lord makes her confess what she has done and then says: *Be thou whole from thy infirmity*; so the act of perfect contrition which secures us forgiveness does not exclude the duty of submitting our sins to the tribunal.

(2). *Jairus' daughter*. This incident also is described in the same context by St. Mark v. 23, and St. Luke viii. 41; the ruler's name is given in both cases. St. Luke says the girl was even then dying; St. Mark makes Jairus say *she is in an extremity*; according to St. Matthew, he takes the worst for granted, and announces that his daughter *has just died*. Unless, then, the translator of the first Gospel into Greek has missed the precise value of a tense, it must be supposed that St. Matthew gives us the actual words of the ruler, who exaggerates in his despair, while St. Mark gives us his thought. Actually, it appears that the news of the death was brought to him on his way home. (So in the other two gospels.) In either case, the demand on Jairus' faith, by contrast with the incredulity of his household, is strongly emphasised.

Jesus rising up followed him; that He rose up and followed—He was at table, cf. verse 10 above—was a lesson in active charity; we know that He could perform such cures without being personally present (ch viii. verse 13). *With his disciples*; He encourages their charity to undertake the journey, although only three of them are actually to be witnesses of the miracle (Mark v. 37). The presence of the flute-players indicates a touch of barbaric survival about Hebrew mourning; and it is this which our Lord reproves when He tells them that the maid is not dead but sleeping; they have got hold of the wrong idea about death. It would be futile to suppose that the girl was really in a trance, for our Lord uses the same paradox about Lazarus (John xi. 11). To *fall asleep* was the consistent euphemism for death in the Church of the apostles (Acts vii. 60, and *passim*). Here, however, as with Lazarus, our Lord will prove the doctrine of survival after death by raising the dead to life.

As in the case of Lazarus, our Lord seems here deliberately to postpone His miraculous action. Instead of speaking the word while the girl is still alive, He must come and touch her; on the way. He delays to converse with a woman whose case is obviously less urgent. The effect is to show His power still more evidently, and to test the faith of His suppliant still more effectively. The application of these considerations to the problem of apparently unanswered prayers needs no emphasizing.

Fifth Sunday after Epiphany, deferred (November 8th).

Gospel. (Matthew xiii. 24-30.)

This parable, like that of the Sower and unlike any other, has been interpreted for us by our Lord Himself, verses 36 to 43

of the same chapter. St. Augustine's view (*vide* Third Nocturn) that the cockle represents heretics rather than sinners, is a private speculation and need not be followed. Nothing in our Lord's own interpretation seems to favour it; and it obscures the parallel between this parable and that of the fishes in the net (vv. 47-50 below). These six parables are surely meant to be in pairs: The Cockle and the Net, the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, the Treasure and the Pearl. The main lesson is that the division of mankind into elect and reprobate (wheat and cockle, good fish and worthless) will not be made manifest until the judgment; till then, both will grow together in the same world (the field, the sea) as part of the same Church (the crop, the net).

A comparison of this parable with that of the Sower, just before, gives us the two sides of the mystery of Predestination and Free-will. In arguing against the Calvinist, we must point out that the Sower casts the same grain everywhere, and the result is determined by the character of the soil on which it falls. In arguing against the Pelagian, we must point out that the Householder and his enemy are represented as planting different kinds of seed in a soil which is everywhere uniform. Our Lord has thus warned us against exaggerating either side of the antimony, and thereby doing away with the mystery.

Doctrinally, the parable of the Cockle is further important because it is the direct negation of the view, asserted by some old-fashioned Protestants and deeply underlying modern Protestant thought, that all men of good will, whatever their creed, are "Christians," and nobody else; that the Church is a collection of people who are all destined to go to Heaven, and that an institutional Church like ours, which admittedly contains sinners as well as saints, is contrary to the Spirit of the Gospel. If they would read the Gospel, they would see that the Church is not a company of saints, but a miscellaneous collection, like the crop in the field or the net in the sea, which awaits a process of sorting-out at the Last Judgment. The word "then" in verse 43 of this chapter is exceedingly emphatic, *then and not till then*; we shall never know until the Last Judgment which are the souls to whom Christ brought redemption. Meanwhile, we go on tending the crop, dragging the net, blindly; not certain what the effect of our labours will be in this case or that.

For practical purposes, whether we think of the crop as representing mankind in general or the Church in particular, the lesson we ought to derive from the parable is evidently one of patience in the presence of those scandals, whether in the world or in the Church, which sometimes threaten to try our faith. We are not to ask why God allows a persecution to continue, or oppressors of the poor to flourish; He is holding His hand, biding His time—retribution will come later. We are not to ask why, if the Church is really His representative on earth, the lives of so many Christians, sometimes even in

high places, have been unsanctified and even dissolute; He will judge them all in the light of the opportunities they had—but later on, not now. This seems to be our Lord's usual meaning when He talks in His parables of the householder who goes to sleep (Mark iv. 26), or the king who goes into a far country (Matthew xxi. 33, and elsewhere); He means that in this time of our probation God *appears* to be indifferent, *appears* to take no notice, not interfering to punish the wicked or to protect His own. (Perhaps it was with the same lesson in view that He allowed Himself to sleep while He was crossing the Lake.) Actually a time of discrimination is coming later on; we must not, then, be despondent over the prosperity of sinners, still less let ourselves be carried away by imitation of them into a like fatal carelessness.

Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, deferred (November 15th).

Gospel. (Matthew xiii. 31-35.)

The two parables are evidently a pair. Notice that one refers to a man, the other to a woman; so in Luke, ch. xv.: *What man among you, having a hundred sheep . . . or what woman, having ten groats. . . .* Our Lord suits His illustrations to the capacity of the various auditors who are present; a point worth commenting on in the pulpit, and still more worth considering before going into the pulpit.

The two parables resemble one another in being concerned with the spread of the Christian Church in the world. They resemble one another in suggesting that its influence is not a sudden intrusion, but a gradual growth; in this respect, they are fatal to the modern "Liberal" notion that our Lord believed His Death would be the signal for a catastrophe of nature and the inauguration of a new world-system, a millennium. (With Advent coming on, this point is just worth mentioning.) They resemble one another in insisting that the Christian Church looks insignificant in its beginnings, but contains the germs of an irresistible growth.

They differ from one another in so far as the Mustard-seed prophesies the growth of Christendom, whereas the Leaven prophesies the diffusion of Christianity. In the one case, we are to think of the Church as an organic body, which sucks in from the soil around it (the world) fresh material to swell its own stature (converts, and souls generally). In the other case, we are to think of the Christian religion as an influence which pervades and reforms the world around it by the power of its own life.

The text demands, clearly, some kind of historical estimate, whether of the Church's growth or of her influence, whether in the world generally or in our own country, whether in the whole course of the centuries or within some given period. It will be well to avoid exaggeration here, and to consider what

there is to be said on the other side, e.g., the argument that the Church gains in numbers as much as she loses; and the argument that much of humanitarian effort (identified in the public mind with "Christianity") has shown its greatest acceleration in the last century and a half, and often with little apparent encouragement from the leaders of the Church. The point to be insisted on in answer to these difficulties is that Christian growth is necessarily slow, partly through the imperfections of individual Christians, partly through the hindrances put in her way by her enemies, partly through the exaggerations of her principles by movements outside the Church, from which she has to react. The Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* may well be brought in here, to illustrate the vitality of the Church's influence, and the hindrances which prevent that influence being properly felt. Happily, the history of the Church in our own country during the last century or so is a good illustration both of the Mustard-seed growing and of the Leaven at work.

Twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost (November 22nd).

Gospel. (Matthew xxiv. 15-35.)

The formal exposition of this Gospel would demand both an expenditure of time and a closeness of attention which a modern congregation can hardly be expected to give. For it seems clear that our Lord's prophecy refers in part to something which now lies in the past, viz., the destruction of Jerusalem, and in part to something which still lies in the future, viz., the consummation of the world. To distinguish these elements would be a laborious business; we should have to consider, too, the apologetic side of the question; the rationalist assertion that our Lord and His apostles mistakenly antedated the imminence of the Last Judgment. It seems better, then, on the whole, to give some general considerations suitable to the beginning of Advent.

(1). The duration of the present world-order is uncertain, because God wills that it should be hidden from us. Just as the moment of death is kept hidden from the individual soul, so the date of the Judgment is kept hidden from the race at large. And there is the same reason for it; we are meant to be continually on the alert, and we are meant to think about eternity, not to behave as if this material existence were everything. The obscurity of those passages, like to-day's Gospel, in which our Lord prophesies His Second Coming is presumably deliberate; if He had been more explicit, we should have known too much about the future, more than is good for us.

(2). The devastation of the world by war and pestilence, the general corruption of manners and decline of faith, has been interpreted at various times, wrongly, as heralding the world's immediate dissolution. You see this even in the days of the

apostles (cf., the warnings in Thessalonians and II Peter), in the time of St. Gregory (cf., breviary lessons), and again in the Middle Ages. *All this is the beginning of troubles. . . . The end is not yet*—our Lord wants us to understand that the great crises of history will, as each comes, suggest to certain minds the imminence of a world-catastrophe; there will be false prophets saying: "Lo! Here is Christ," or "Lo! There," but we are to wait patiently as before, undisturbed by such alarms. We must avoid too great anxiety about the Judgment, just as we must avoid carelessness about it.

(3). These periods of tribulation that come upon mankind, or upon some large section of mankind, all at once, may well be regarded as a sort of anticipation or rehearsal (you might almost say) of that greater Tribulation which is to precede the End. And in these, as in that other, it is clear what the attitude of Christians ought to be. We must flee to the mountains; take refuge, that is, in a loving confidence towards God; we are not to return to take anything from our houses; that is to say, we are to cultivate a spirit of detachment from worldly goods which will make it impossible for world-calamities or persecution to harm us. It is in such a spirit of confidence and detachment that we Christians ought to face the coming year, with all that it may bring of commotion and distress.

First Sunday in Advent (November 29th).

The Epistle. (Rom. xiii. 11-14.)

The Gospel for this Sunday being only a second report of the same discourse which forms the Gospel for the last Sunday after Pentecost, it seems best to substitute an exposition of the Epistle.

St. Paul has been urging the Roman Church, in language which has become a theological classic, to give obedience to the higher powers, as being ordained of God. It was not very long before that the Jews had been expelled from Rome by Claudius; and it may well be that the Jewish-Christian body, evidently a strong one, was tempted to take part in underground political activities. Circumstances, St. Paul seems to say, are bringing us out into the open more than formerly; we have to live in the light of that fact, careful of our reputation as Christians.

The words *than when we believed* mean, of course, "than when we first believed"—that is to say, than when we were baptised. Baptism is often described in the New Testament by reference to the act of faith which accompanies it; *Himself believed, and his whole household*, etc. St. Paul is writing in the fifties, yet he treats the time when the first conversions were made, whether by St. Peter or by some other missionary, as already ancient history; so quickly does time move when

grace is specially active. And, in the fifties, things are somehow different. Deliverance is nearer now than it was. What kind of deliverance is St. Paul thinking of? It seems clear that in those early days Christians felt they were going through a period of unnatural strain. The Jews were suffering tribulation; and no doubt many Christian Jews had been banished from Rome by Claudius' edict. In Judæa itself popular feeling was growing more and more restive against the Roman occupation. On the other side, Christians were being persecuted everywhere by the non-Christian Jews; St. Paul himself could bear witness to that. Where was it all going to end? In a deliverance from on high; that was clear from our Lord's own prophecy. What picture they formed of that deliverance is not clear; actually, the solution came with the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, after which the Jewish race ceased to count, and it was a straight issue between the Christian Church and the heathen world.

Towards that consummation, St. Paul warns his readers, the time is drawing on. The night of obscurity in which Christianity was first cradled (like its Founder at Bethlehem) was brightening towards the dawn; the Christian Church was going to shine forth before the world, in the full glare of publicity. And for that reason, it was all the more important that Christians should remember the obligations they had taken upon themselves; should be clothed in bright armour of good living, to catch and reflect the light which was being shed upon them by the fuller manifestation of Christ's message to the world. They were to abstain, as a matter of course, from the riotousness and the impurities which were common among their heathen neighbours. They were to abstain equally from strife and envying—from the rest of the epistle, it is clear that St. Paul was distressed by rumours of disunion in the Roman Church, and it is perhaps this lesson which he is specially anxious to indicate. By "the flesh" St. Paul always means, not the body and its appetites only, but the whole of unregenerate man, his pride, his quarrelsomeness, etc. (see the list in Gal. v. 20); "the flesh" is the natural man, as opposed to the man who has *put on Jesus Christ*.

There is a curious analogy between our position as Catholics in modern England, and the position of Christians, in Rome at any rate, when St. Paul wrote. Christians had not yet felt the brunt of heathen opposition; they were accustomed to being persecuted by the Jews, or by the heathen only because they were mistaken for Jews. So we have grown accustomed to being criticized by other Christians, or by the irreligious only because they confuse us with other Christians. When St. Paul wrote, he foresaw the disappearance of the Jewish influence in the world of his day; it is a commonplace observation that the general influence of the Christian religion is waning in our country. And that means that we Catholics, like the Christians of the seventies, shall be thrown more into

the limelight; we shall come into our own, and the issue, between Catholicism and the new heathenism, will be clearer than before. We shall be left almost alone as the guardians of Christian morality. Are we ready for that? Are our own lives prepared to stand the closer scrutiny which they will get—indeed, are already getting—from an unbelieving world? Too many of us live disedifying lives; and those of us whose appetites are under better control often give scandal by our quarrelsomeness and bitterness. We all need to put on the Lord Jesus Christ; to clothe ourselves, this Advent, with the simplicity and humility of Bethlehem.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

FASCICULES XCIII to XCVI of the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* were published in June. The major dogmatic articles treat of Nominalism, Ontologism, Anglican Orders, Order and Ordination, Novatian and Novatianism, Origen and Origenism. In the article on Anglican Orders M. Marchal, Professor at Nancy, discusses successively the origin of the Anglican hierarchy (the rise and growth of the rupture with the Catholic Church, the Nag's Head consecration of Parker, the consecration of Barlow); the consistent teaching of the Church for three centuries, prior to the *Apostolicae Curae*, that their orders were invalid; the occasion, the authority and the doctrine of Pope Leo's Bull. He proves that from the beginning no Anglican minister was ever admitted as a Catholic priest except after absolute ordination; and this practice rested not on doubts as to Barlow's consecration, nor on a belief in the Nag's Head fable, but on indisputable theological arguments. While admitting, as he must, the absolute authority of the *Apostolicae Curae*, M. Marchal demurs to the contention that it is infallible: it deals, he argues, with a point of discipline, as Leo XIII himself says, *idem caput disciplinae, etsi iure iam definitum*, and it is on the weight of the arguments that the stress is laid in commanding the submission of Catholics; he finds himself, therefore, unable to agree with the late Fr. Sidney F. Smith, S.J., who, in his article on Anglican Orders in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, tome III, col. 1224 (as also in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*), argued that the document was infallible, as bearing on a dogmatic fact. Surely, Fr. Sidney Smith is right. The question at issue was a dogmatic fact, whether, namely, a given method of ordaining is the Sacrament of Order. And the Pope's intention was to impose a truth, and that not merely by the force of the arguments, but by the full weight of his teaching authority. To show this, we quote the end of the *Apostolicae Curae*, and also the important passage from the subsequent letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, italicizing the decisive phrases. First, the conclusion of the decree: "Praesentes vero litteras et quaecumque in ipsis habentur nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis aut obreptionis sive intentionis Nostrae vitio aliove quovis defectu notari vel impugnari posse; sed *semper validas et in suo robore fore et esse*, atque *ab omnibus cuiusvis gradus et praeeminentiae inviolabiliter in iudicio et extra observari debere decernimus*; irritum quoque et inane si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate vel praetextu, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari declarantes, contrariis non

obstantibus quibuscumque." The Pope piles up vigorous language to show that he is exercising his authority in its fullness. The decision will never be changed; and all without exception must accept it *in judicio et extra*, by internal assent as well as by external observance. No question of mere discipline there, but of intellectual adherence to a truth imposed. The confirmatory letter to Cardinal Richard leaves even less room for subterfuge. "Religioni apud Anglos aeternaeque animarum saluti pro munere prospicientes, Constitutionem Apostolicae Curae, ut nosti, proxime edidimus. In ea causam gravissimam de ordinationibus Anglicanis, iure quidem a Decessoribus Nostris multo antea definitam, indulgenter tamen a Nobis ex integri revocatam, *consilium fuit absolute iudicare penitusque dirimere. Idque sane perfecimus* eo argumentorum pondere *aeque formularum tum perspicuitate, tum auctoritate*, ut sententiam Nostram nemo prudens recteque animatus compellere in dubitationem posset, *catholici autem omnes summo deberent obsequio amplecti, tamquam perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem.*" The Pope here stresses not only the weight of the arguments as a motive for accepting his decision, but also the force of his authority clearly expressed. Further, he again affirms, as in the decree, that all Catholics must give complete submission to his decision as absolute and irrevocable. That this submission is intellectual assent is obvious from the context, and doubly obvious from a later phrase in the letter, in which he speaks of the Anglicans seeking the truth about their orders from him and then not accepting the truth, "*veritatem ipsam a Nobis coram Deo significatam.*"¹

M. Fritz, of the episcopal curia of Strasbourg, contributes a very careful article on the Second Council of Orange, A.D. 529. He discusses the different theories as to its aim and origin, and explores the sources of its canons in the writings of St. Prosper and St. Augustine. He proves that all the canons received the approbation of Pope Boniface II, and not merely the first eight. The 22nd canon: *Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum*, which Hefele called the *crux interpretum*, he explains in the sense that St. Augustine and the Council are not denying the ability of fallen man to do naturally good acts, but are stressing the complete inefficacy of those acts in themselves without grace for eternal salvation.

Nearly six columns of the *Dictionnaire* are devoted to the life of Cardinal Noris. The distinguished Augustinian Cardinal is of interest to Englishmen, because he was of English descent. He was a thorough scholar, learned not only in theology, but also in history, archaeology and numismatics. For twenty-four years he gave daily fourteen hours to study, and five only to sleep; and he never took a holiday. Forty years after his death the Spanish Inquisition placed his *Historia Pelagiana* on the Spanish Index as being Jansenistic. This act brought forth a strong protest from Benedict XIV, who declared that the

¹ These documents are in *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. 29, p. 203 and p. 664.

works of Noris had been three times officially examined and found free from contradiction with the defined dogmas of the Church, and the Augustinian system of grace could freely be taught.

Père M. Jugie, of the Augustinians of the Assumption, has recently added another tome to his *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium Dissidentium*. It deals with the Greco-Russian teaching on the Last Things and on the Church. Previous tomes had dealt with the origin, history and sources of their theology, and with their doctrine of the Sacraments. The writer is one of the greatest living authorities on Byzantine Christianity, and his scholarly work is indispensable to all who are interested in the problem of the return of the East to unity. With regard to the Last Things, P. Jugie informs us, all or almost all the Greco-Russians are agreed on the following points: no merit or satisfaction after death; the universal resurrection; general judgment for all, including the demons, and eternal separation of the good from the bad; unequal rewards and punishments; transformation of the universe at the end of the world; the lawfulness and value of prayers for the dead. On all other details, especially on the particular judgment, the existence of Purgatory, the nature of beatitude, there is much disagreement. The reason of the confusion is, of course, that after the first seven councils the Easterns recognize no binding dogmatic definition of their Church, and their theologians are left to abound in their own sense. In his treatise on the Church, P. Jugie emphasizes the difficulty of depicting the present Eastern Church. Her ancient rigid stability is giving way since the War to internal disruption. The great Russian Church has been made almost unrecognizable by revolution, and domestic dissensions; and the collapse of Russia has had enormous repercussions over the rest of the near East. Hence the descriptions of the constitution and character of the Eastern churches, to which we are accustomed, are now antiquated; they deal with a condition of affairs that no longer obtains. Practically nothing has been written on their present state, and what little has been written is not altogether true.

Turning to recent Catholic works in English, we give the place of honour to Fr. D'Arcy's fine book, "*The Nature of Belief*."² It combines a penetrating study of the nature and possibility of certainty, truth and belief with a re-presentation and explanation of Newman's *Grammar of Assent*. Of Newman's classic Fr. D'Arcy says: "Much has been written on this subject since his day, but the *Grammar of Assent* still remains the masterpiece which no one can safely neglect. If I find myself unable to accept all the conclusions of that book it is not because of any lack of admiration for the author or liking for his line of thought. Indeed, so penetrating is his analysis, so closely in touch with experience, that one feels almost

² Sheed & Ward, pp. 336. 7s. 6d.

invariably that what he says is right and that it is only the framework of his language that causes difficulty at times. For some reason or other his explanations do not seem to have received the attention they deserve from scholars and students of psychology and philosophy. For this reason alone they deserve to be explained at length, but in truth so pertinent do I find his views that I cannot advance without their help." Since there is no subject on which our contemporaries are so lamentably ignorant and mistaken as on this very fundamental and vital subject of Faith, we give a hearty welcome to Fr. D'Arcy's able, convincing and scholarly essay.

Three other works on Faith, more popular in conception than Fr. D'Arcy's, are: *Religious Assent*, by Dom M. Pontifex, O.S.B.;³ *Faith and the Act of Faith*, by P. Bainvel, S.J.;⁴ and *Faith and its Rational Justification*, by the Rev. G. Brunhes.⁵ The last named may be particularly recommended.

Polytheism and Fetishism, by Fr. M. Briault, C.S., Sp., translated by Dr. Browne of Maynooth,⁶ is a most welcome addition to our few Catholic works in English on Comparative Religion. Fr. Briault is an authority on the subject, and is especially competent in Fetishism, having spent many years as a missionary among the primitive African peoples.

In *Mary's Assumption*, by Fr. Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J.,⁷ we have a much-needed book, and a very fine book indeed. It is full of sound dogma, presented in an easy and attractive manner. Briefly, yet clearly, the author expounds the entire theology of the Assumption. He first discusses the account of the Assumption as given in the apocryphal writings and in the Roman breviary; then he turns to Mary's death, its how and why, and to her burial, and so to the Assumption itself, for which he gives about ten arguments, not all, of course, equally cogent: arguments from the tradition of the West and of the East and of the Sacred Liturgy, an argument from prescription, and another from Sacred Scripture, and then five proofs from reason, based on Our Blessed Lady's Divine Motherhood, her Immaculate Conception, her spotless virginity, her perfect sanctity, and the devoted affection of her Divine Son for her. Fr. O'Connell's book is characterized throughout by sobriety and good sense. Theology itself is allowed to speak without any fall-back on sentimentalism or emotional pietism; and theology is well able of itself to raise the Mother of God to the highest peak of greatness attainable by a pure creature. Piety based on dogma is sound, satisfying and lasting; it suits the make-up of man, who must know before he can will, and who tends to love the more strongly that which he knows more

³ Constable & Co.

⁴ B. Herder Book Co.

⁵ Sands' Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge.

⁶ Sands' Catholic Library, 3s. 6d.

⁷ The America Press, pp. ix and 166. 6s.

richly and more deeply; it harmonizes man with his Maker; for now in him, as in God, you have *Verbum spirans Amorem*.

II. PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. FULTON J. SHEEN, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

THE most important problem in modern speculation is the relation between philosophy and science. The two extreme and erroneous solutions of the problem are either to make philosophy a science or else make science a philosophy.

The first error of reducing philosophy to science had its remote origin in English Empiricism, but it never came to full bloom and blossom until the time of Kant. Descartes held that the intellect attains directly and immediately its thought, the *Cogito*, but not the reality. It was consequently very easy for Kant to conclude that the reality behind these representations remains forever unknown. In saying the phenomenal alone was knowable, Kant erected a wall between physical science and the philosophical real. Any conclusion concerning the latter possessed therefore only a relative value. Comte accepted the fundamental position of Kant, and made philosophy synonymous with the correlation and grouping of empirical forces.

H. Poincaré and Mach developed a theory of science independent of philosophy, and paved the way for Pragmatism and Instrumentalism which was nothing else than a philosophy reduced to the method and content of science. If the real is unknowable (as Kant held), and if science desires nothing more than to describe the observable in the language of mathematics (as Poincaré, Duhem, Boutroux, Milhaud, Mach, Dingler, and others were contending) then, said the Pragmatists, Philosophy is nothing more than generalized experimental science. Truth, they said, is ambulatory and arrived at by experiment. The existence of God is not objective, but depends upon the way that belief works for a certain individual. Religion, too, has a value if its deliverances are helpful for living. In a word, philosophy and science were both concerned with the phenomenal, the observable, and the experimental, the former differing from the latter only inasmuch as its generalizations had a *value* for life.

The other extreme reduced not philosophy to science, but rather elevated science to a philosophy. Its method is best described as the lyricism of science, or the making philosophy dance to the tune piped for it by science. Science has not always piped the same tune, for the fashion in tunes changes. The lyricism of science began in earnest with Darwin, who popularised biology. Immediately biology was extended beyond the confines of organic life to morals, ethics, logic, religion, and even God. The next vogue in science was psychology, thanks principally to Meyers and James, who did much to

emphasise the importance of its subconscious mind. It was not long, however, before psychology overflowed its field of mental processes, and the subconscious theory was erected into a philosophy which explained guilt as an "explosion," God as a "mental projection," and the conversion of Saint Paul as "an eruption of the subconscious mind." The new fashion to-day is physics with relativity dominating a universe of space and time. The new physics hardly saw the light of day when the lyricists began to make a philosophy out of it. Professor S. Alexander told us that Space-Time was its fabric of the universe and that God is "a creature of space-time." Professor Alfred N. Whitehead, formerly of Cambridge and now of Harvard, who could be one of the clearest of philosophical writers, but who is actually the most obscure, has made the new physics the basis of a new epistemology and God "The Harmony of Epochal Occasion." What the next style in science will be, no one presently knows, but if the present temper continues, it will be the basis of some equally new, vague philosophy.

Between these two erroneous extremes, there is a happy medium, in which philosophy does not swallow up science, nor does science become a philosophy, but in which one is related to the other by subordination. There is already a tendency on the part of some contemporaries to recognize the justice of this solution. Haldane protests against the extreme solution of considering all science on the same plane, while Meyerson in his *Identité et Réalité* and later works, rebels vigorously against the absolute separation of philosophy and the sciences, and returns to some extent to the conceptions of Descartes and Aristotle. An excellent critical study of Meyerson's views has recently been published by M. Gillet in volume seven of *Archives de Philosophie*.

The true solution of the problem is to be found in the ultra-modern writings of Saint Thomas whose theory concerning the relation between science and philosophy is here set down in the form of principles:—

1. There are three supreme sciences : physics, mathematics, and metaphysics. Physics is concerned with matter inasmuch as it is mobile, sensible, and clothed with certain qualities and properties which are experimentally observable; it considers things in their concrete and material reality, making abstraction only from the fact that a thing is singular. This is the first degree of abstraction.

Mathematics consider material things just as physics, but it makes abstraction from all their sensible properties such as light, heat, colour, and considers only quantity, number, or extent by itself. The object of thought cannot exist without sensible matter, but it can be conceived without it, for nothing sensible or experimental or tangible enters into the definition of a line or a cube root. This is the second degree of abstraction.

Finally, the human mind can concern itself with things, not merely inasmuch as they are in movement, or inasmuch as they are quantitative, but simply inasmuch as they *are* or have *being*.

There are certain objects of thought which can only be conceived without matter, such as God, Justice, Fortitude, Beauty and Goodness. This Science which concerns itself with *being as being* is Metaphysics and belongs to the third degree of abstraction.

2. There is a hierarchy of sciences as there is a hierarchy among the various orders of creation. The nobler must rule the less noble, and the inferior must receive its fundamental principles from a superior science. It is, therefore, permitted to apply the science of mathematics to physics in order to produce a mathematical physics, but it is not permitted to make a mathematics out of physics. Quanto scientia aliqua abstractiora et simpliciora considerat, tanto eius principia sunt magis applicabilia aliis scientiis; unde principia mathematicae sunt applicabilia naturalibus, non autem e converso, propter quod Physica est ex suppositione mathematicae sed non e converso, ut patet in III Coeli. (In Lib. Boet. de Trinitate, q. 5, art 3, ad 5 et ad 6.)

Although it is permissible to interpret the *measurable* according to the rules of mathematics, as modern science is wont to do, it is well to remember that such a science is infra-philosophical. Failure to grasp the infra-philosophical character of mathematical physics is largely responsible for the substitution of *conditionality* for *causality* which is found in such writers as Eddington and Whitehead.

3. The final explanation of the measurable is not possible until the principles of metaphysics are brought to bear upon it. The mathematical interpretation of the measurable gives the *description*, but the metaphysical interpretation of the measurable alone gives *explanation*. It was this combination of sciences during the Middle Ages which produced what was then called "The Philosophy of Nature"—a science which is to-day practically unknown, because mathematics has been considered the supreme science of interpretation. It is quite true that part of the mediæval philosophy of nature is antiquated, but not all of it. Like all sciences it was made up of two parts: metaphysics and physics (the observable). The physics of those times is quite antiquated, for the advance of technology and instruments has given us a clearer understanding of facts. But the metaphysical principles which interpreted those facts are just as living to-day as they were then. We observe facts better to-day because of our microscopes and telescopes, but that is no guarantee that we *interpret* the facts better. The metaphysical principles of causality,

finality, order, harmony, and efficiency, have lost none of their vitality simply because they attach themselves immediately to *being* as *being* and not to *this* being.

Science to-day does not know God, not because it is atheistic, but because its principles are not sufficiently broad in scope to lead to God.

The mathematical infinite is not the infinity of God. When, however, scientists begin to apply the rigid principles of metaphysics to the observable and measurable, instead of the principles of mathematics (which application, I repeat is valid) they will perforce be led to the First Cause which is God instead of a vague "harmony of epochal occasions." The objection that metaphysics is too remote from physics for application to the observable might apply to idealistic metaphysics, but it does not apply to the metaphysics of common sense. There is a place for a philosophy of nature to-day just as there was in the days of Aristotle, and Aquinas. Metaphysics of the sensible world is possible, not inasmuch as it is sensible, but insofar as it is intelligible, since being is the object of all intellects, human, angelic, and divine. Sanity will once more be the heritage of philosophy when it breaks with the present popular tendency to consider philosophy as having only the same value as the empirical sciences. Saint Thomas calls the tendency to make all sciences uniform in method and content a "sin."⁸

There is danger that the uniform method will be carried too far. Relativity is valid within its own order perhaps, but it becomes laughable when it states that we have six toes on one foot counted one way, and four on the other foot counted the other way. The temporal and the spatial are not the best approaches to the non-temporal and the non-spatial. There is much necessity of us harking back to the wisdom of Aquinas, to learn all over again that metaphysics and not physics is the science which properly studies God. *Quaedam vero sunt speculabilia quae non dependent a materia secundum esse . . . id est, divina scientia vel metaphysica.* The standpoint of religion and metaphysics is more inclusive than the merely physical one, as being is more extensive than space-time. Man is greater than all his standpoints, and the real problem, as St. Thomas so well says, is to find that standpoint of the whole man and the whole universe from which to judge the validity of all partial and subordinate views. On the contrary, there is something tragic in our modern philosophy of religion. Much of it is intoxicated by modern physics; space-time has gone to its head; whole cosmic streams of flux have swept it away from its moorings. Space-time has become a cult and Time a God and Physics a Revelation.

⁸ *Et propter hoc peccant qui uniformiter in tribus speculativae partibus procedere nituntur—De Trinitate Boetii, p. 6, art. 2.*

Philosophers of religion breathlessly await the latest decree of space-time physics as industrialists await the latest design in machinery. And what food for thought! Sacred Scripture says: "There will be no more of time." Philosophers of religion to-day have constructed the universe out of it—and even God!

III. RECENT WORK IN SCIENCE.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, PH.D., M.A.

Some fresh considerations valuable in the controversy on Evolution which is always with us can be derived from a book by Austin H. Clark, *The New Evolution, Zoogenesis*.⁹ The author accompanied the expedition of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries' Steamer *Albatross* in the North and North-West Pacific in 1906. On that cruise he made detailed investigations of the animals of the open ocean and of the sea bottom down to a depth of 11,838 feet beneath the surface. A thoughtful observer, he challenges the commonly received theories on the ground that they are the result of "a very narrow view-point." Biologists have been content to explain man's origin from the evidence afforded by his dissected body merely. Much more is to be gained by considering him in his relations to the whole world.

Mr. Clark is impressed by the significance of the "mental mechanism" which controls the body of living things and which cannot be interpreted in terms of physics and chemistry. Unfortunately he rides his hobby too hard and goes too far. He questions the usually accepted discontinuity between the "mental" equipment of the lower animals and man; he will not readily accept any fundamental difference between works of instinct and works of reason. Thus he speaks of the tunnels and galleries made by insects and the tunnels and chimneys made by spiders, "the former provided with strong hinged lids, which show engineering skill and knowledge of the laws of physics"—which, of course, is ludicrous. The social activities and slave-controlling characteristics of ants have long been recognized, but are we to suppose that there was a Plato or Aristotle among them in the distant past, and that principles of strategy and politics are the basis of their successful wars and economies?

The most significant characteristic of man is his "serial" family life. Of all vertebrates he is the only one which has a family normally composed of a series of dependent young in all stages of development ranging from recently born and wholly dependent through various stages of decreasing dependency to sub-adult or adult. The other vertebrates produce offspring only at such periods as allow of the attainment of independence by one set of young before the appearance of the next. From

⁹ Ballière, Tindall & Cox, 1930.

this fact the author very properly argues the necessity of dual parental control and responsibility in man during a long period of years. Elsewhere among man's nearest neighbours this need is not discernible. The mothers raise their young unaided.

But apparently this is not true of certain insects. They have a highly developed family life.

With this development of parental instinct goes the strikingly human characteristic of the use of fire and tools. The author tells us that this is human from the beginning, that there is not the slightest evidence of any gradual acquisition: an argument against evolution from any lower form of primate to man. But among certain ants and reptiles there is found an instinct to use, not fire, but artificial heat of bacterial origin. This heat is derived from decaying vegetation "consciously and knowingly gathered and assembled for that purpose." And with regard to tools, digger wasps use little pebbles or bits of stick held in their jaws. But they never *make* their tools. Last, but most amazing of all, the author declares that some insects have an instinct for what he calls clothes!

In spite of his excesses of interpretation, this writer cannot be dismissed from the evolution controversy. He makes a good case against any tree-like development within the phylum. He is no creationist, but he believes that all living things are on the same plane of development though in some mysterious way they all come from a common ancestor capable of producing each and all by mutations. Life is derived only from life.

Another book on evolution, also hailing from America, is *Life and Evolution, An Introduction to General Biology*, by S. J. Holmes, Ph.D., Professor of Zoology in the University of California.¹⁰ It is a very readable book for the layman. It is a book that could be recommended to any priest who, either for cultural interest or for the purposes of psychology, should wish to have a general outline of the science of living things. It is not by any means a text-book, but its scientific information is accurate and clearly conveyed. It gives an adequate account of the tissues—nerve, muscle, skin and blood. It deals clearly and simply with the rather difficult and complicated processes of cell-division, of reproduction in its various forms, and of embryonic development. The different grades of life are described morphologically.

A chapter on the Development of Social Life, in which, among other things, is told the particularly fascinating story of the ants, is hard to square in some parts with the impressions derived from Mr. Clark's work. For example, the bees show all stages of social development from the solitude of *Osmia papaveris* to the matriarchate of the common hive bee. "The female of this species (*O. papaveris*) constructs a very simple nest consisting of a shallow hole in the ground which she lines, in accordance with her fastidious taste, with the petals of the

¹⁰ A. C. Black. pp. v. + 449. 12s. 6d.

poppy. Then she proceeds to store the nest with pollen and honey, and when the hole is about half-filled, she deposits an egg upon her supply of provision, fills up the remainder of the hole with dirt and goes off to repeat the same performance several times more during the season. The young larva eats the stored food, pupates, and emerges the next year as a mature bee. During no part of her industrious life does the *Osmia* come into contact with her progeny." Whereas we read that "orphan monkeys were always adopted and carefully guarded by other monkeys, both males and females." There is no flat contradiction of Mr. Clark, but the emphasis on social advance is clearly shifted from insects to higher animals. Again, "mutual aid in animals, as Kropotkin has shown, is both widespread and important. In the higher animals it is prompted by affection and social sympathy, which comes to be more developed as life advances. Among the insects mutual aid acts to a greater extent upon a basis of blind instinct."

There is an excellent chapter on micro-organisms, in which we are told how the study of them has contributed to the conquest of such diseases as malaria, diphtheria, tuberculosis and hydrophobia.

In Chapter XIV, Heredity and Variation, a good and thorough account of Mendelism is given, and this and the following chapter on "Heredity and Environment" will repay careful study.

The Chapter on Organic Evolution is a useful recapitulation of the ordinary arguments in favour of the theory of descent, presented very completely and without the passion and contempt of other people's views which so commonly disfigure the popular literature of evolution. The result is completely opposed to that of Mr. Clark, whose account of the pedigree of the horse will be found as a useful corrective of the more usual one found here. Professor Holmes' conclusion of the palæontological argument stands as follows: "The testimony of palæontology as to the origin of man, although much less complete than could be desired, points clearly to the descent of man from some ape-like ancestor. No competent morphologist supposes that man was derived from any of the existing species of apes. Man and the apes are considered as representing the ends of a group of branches which lead back to a common stem."

The final chapter on The Eugenic Predicament emphasizes the fact recognized by all that voluntary Birth Control has hitherto worked dysgenically. The author is anxious to see the balance redressed by an increase of the better sort and a decrease of the worse. There is nothing strikingly new in the treatment, our old friends, the Jukeses and the Kallikaks, are here as before—and with the conclusions we cannot agree; but, again, it is useful to have a good summary of the arguments which the defender of Christian morals has to meet.

Much more advanced in its presentment and apparatus than

either of these two books is the volume, *Recent Advances in Entomology*, by A. D. Imms, the Chief Entomologist of the Rothamstead Experimental Station, Harpenden. After various chapters on such subjects as Morphology and Palæontology, Mr. Imms gives fascinating accounts of the behaviour of insects and their various tropisms—their responses to stimuli of light, colour, touch, etc. Finally, his results are applied practically to problems of agriculture. It is of particular importance nowadays to observe how laboratory work is devoted to the safeguarding and promotion of agricultural interests, and to reflect upon the importance and ultimate economy of State aid for scientific research.

Above all these books in philosophic interest stands Dr. J. S. Haldane's *The Philosophical Basis of Biology*.¹¹ For years Dr. Haldane has been attacking the mechanical framework imposed upon physiology in the second half of the nineteenth century. As early as 1908, in his presidential address to the British Association he said that "in physiology, and biology generally, we are dealing with phenomena which, as far as our present knowledge goes, not only differ in complexity, but differ in kind from physical and chemical phenomena; and that the fundamental working hypothesis of physiology must differ correspondingly from those of physics and chemistry." This was the burden of his admirable volume, *The New Physiology*, in 1919. And to-day in these printed Donnellan Lectures he again shows the utter inadequacy of physics and chemistry as a means of explanation of life. For him the life of an organism involves the co-ordinated maintenance of detailed structure and activity, a concept which is inseparable from a consideration of the relationship between the organism and its environment. Function, structure and environment must be conceived as a whole. He is as much opposed to extreme vitalism as he is to mechanism; in fact, he considers that both systems labour under the one essential defect of treating the organism as if it were a thing apart from its surroundings. He invokes Berkeley's authority at the beginning, but he develops Berkeley's philosophy. He insists on the necessity of God in the universe, a God continually creating.

In the first lecture Dr. Haldane explains that the axiom on which scientific biology depends is the existence of life conceived as an active maintenance of the normal and specific structure and environment of an organism. His second lecture illustrates the true biological method. The history of the growth of our knowledge of the physiology of breathing is unfolded, and to those who do not know the story, but have sufficient familiarity with scientific language to be unafraid of a few technical terms, this will prove a revelation of the wonderful complexity and of the exquisite maintenance of physiological normals, which are characteristic of life processes. It well illustrates the

¹¹ Hodder & Stoughton. pp. 160+x. 7s. 6d.

lecturer's point: "We just have to admit that from the physico-chemical standpoint we are in the presence of something which we do not understand—the mystery of life." In the third lecture he moves into a wider field and considers the whole universe in the light of his principle and of the principles of other sciences.

We certainly cannot follow him all the way. Indeed, we must demur to his expression of fundamental philosophical principles in which he seems to deny reality to matter and separate existence to individuals. He infers the existence of God from the human struggle after truth, righteousness and beauty. "It is neither consistent with religion nor with our actual experience to regard ourselves as nothing more than a series of obscure happenings on an obscure planet in a gigantic physical universe. Our universe is not outside of us because we are not outside of God, and the universe is the progressive manifestation of God. This is the basis of religion, and however often religion may be obscured by mistaken scientific metaphysics or buried in equally mistaken theology, it will return in ever clearer form to guide and inspire humanity as it has done to such an extent in the past, in spite of the baseless superstitions which have often been associated with it."

But, in spite of necessary limitations of our admiration and assent, we must recognize that Dr. Haldane was a pioneer in the modern revolt against mechanism, and remains a stalwart champion of a scientific hypothesis which, however mistaken in its credentials and misdirected in its philosophical conclusions, is at least far more in harmony with common-sense than was its predecessor and far more promising as an instrument of scientific progress.

Apologists, Philosophers and all those who are interested in the incidence of the findings of modern science on religion will find much value in a clearly and brightly written book produced in the Anglican Library of Faith and Thought. It is *Religion and the Reign of Science*,¹² by the Rev. F. L. Cross, of Pusey House, Oxford. The sciences dealt with are Physics, Biology, Psychology, Biblical Criticism and Philosophy. The author puts the various problems in their historical setting and shows how the different schools of theology have met them or can meet them either by rejection, criticism or self-adaptation. Sometimes the attempted reconciliation is flagrantly opposed to anything that we could accept (as in the chapter on Biblical Criticism), but always the writer appears as a thoughtful and sincere seeker after truth, trying to appreciate scientific theories at their proper worth.

¹² Longmans, Green and Co., pp. 111 + ix., 4s. cloth, 2s. 6d. paper covers.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

ECCLESIASTICAL UNIVERSITY REFORM.

In the January number of the CLERGY REVIEW mention was made of the Commission established to frame a scheme of reform for Universities and Faculties of ecclesiastical studies. The results of the Commission's work are embodied in two lengthy documents, the first an Apostolic Constitution, *Deus scientiarum Dominus*, dated May 14th, 1931; and the second the complementary *Ordinationes* of the S.C. of Seminaries and Studies, dated June 12th. (A.A.S., XXIII, pp. 241-262 and 263-284.) The two documents, which together fill the forty-four pages of the *Acta* for July 1st, are published also in handier form in a brochure of eighty pages (price two and a half lire).

THE CONSTITUTION DEUS SCIENTIARUM DOMINUS.

An introduction sets out to illustrate the rôle of the Church as the patron and guardian of learning in all ages and countries. It recalls the erudition of the Fathers, the work of the mediæval abbeys, the foundation of universities old and new, the educative enterprises of the mission field, and such storehouses of learning as the Ambrosian and Vatican libraries. Ignorance alone, the Holy Father continues, quoting Tertullian's *Desinunt odisse qui desinunt ignorare*, is what the Church has reason to fear. The Supreme Pontiffs have always given every encouragement to sacred learning in particular, and from the commencement of his pontificate the present Holy Father has longed to see ecclesiastical Universities and Faculties excel *sicut dignitate sua, ita etiam studiorum subtilitate scientiarumque splendore*.

For Catholic Institutes of Higher Studies, more than a hundred throughout the world, it was desirable that a charter should be drawn up, setting forth their purpose with greater clearness, prescribing their method more carefully, and securing such uniformity as would also take account of local needs. It is imperative to-day that even lay students who show themselves fitted for scientific investigation, should be thoroughly versed in the sacred sciences, and be able at need to defend Catholic truth with vigour. The sacred sciences ought to recover the primacy they once held in public universities.

The report of the Commission and the regulations which follow are limited in scope to Universities and Faculties of ecclesiastical studies. Other institutions, and particularly the Roman Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas, will be considered in later legislation as opportunity may suggest.

There follow the fifty-eight Articles of the Constitution, arranged under five Titles. The following brief synopsis will

sufficiently indicate the far-reaching character of the reform.

i. *General.*

The phrase "Universities and Faculties" must be understood to include five Institutes in the Eternal City: the Pontifical Biblical Institute, the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, the Pontifical Institute of Ecclesiastical and Civil Law (*Utriusque Iuris*), the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, and the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music (art. 3).

To the S.C. of Seminaries and Studies is reserved the canonical erection and supreme control of all Universities and Faculties of ecclesiastical studies, whether established for seculars or for religious, and not excluding those institutions which are situated in Oriental or in missionary territory (art. 4). The statutes and syllabus must receive the approval of the Sacred Congregation, and only approved Universities and Faculties may confer degrees which enjoy canonical effects (art. 5 and 6).

All approved Faculties confer the Licentiate and the Doctorate; they are free to confer the Baccalaureate also. The Baccalaureate marks a student as a suitable candidate to study for the higher degrees; the Licentiate give the power to teach in schools which do not confer degrees; the Doctorate the power to teach in a University or a Faculty. The Faculties of ecclesiastical studies in civil Universities must be brought into line with the new regulations, regard being had, however, to existing national agreements with the Holy See (art. 7-11).

ii. *Personnel and Direction.*

Rule is exercised by "Authorities," the chief of whom are the *Magnus Cancellarius*, the *Rector Magnificus* or the *President*, and the *Deans* of the various Faculties. They are assisted by "Officials." The Great Chancellor is the Ordinary Prelate on whom the University or Faculty depends in law.

The active rule of the whole University is in the hands of the Rector Magnificus, and its component Faculties are controlled by Deans. A separate Faculty is ruled by a President (art. 13-15).

Besides "ordinary" Professors who enjoy full rights, others who are duly qualified should be added with the title of "extraordinary." A Professor, to be lawfully co-opted, must excel in learning, character and prudence; he must be equipped with the necessary Doctorate, and must have shown his capability by certain proofs, especially by written books or dissertations; he must have made the prescribed profession of faith, and received from the Great Chancellor his commission to teach, after the *Nihil Obstat* of the Holy See (art. 19-21).

Any student who wishes to have his name inscribed on the register of a University or Faculty to study for degrees, must bring testimonial or commendatory letters from ecclesiastical

authorities, and also documents to declare: (1) that he has duly completed his classical course; (2) (a) for Theology: that after such classical course, he has studied scholastic philosophy for two years at least, and passed the prescribed examinations; (b) for the Biblical Institute: that he has received the Licentiate in Theology; (c) if a cleric, for a Faculty of Canon Law, or for the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, Law, Christian Archaeology or Sacred Music: that he has completed his philosophical and theological course in accordance with canon 1365 (art. 23-25).

iii. Syllabus.

In Theology, the positive and the scholastic method must be combined. After the truths of faith have been explained and proved from Scripture and Tradition, their essence and mutual relations should be investigated in the light of the rules and teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. In Canon Law, the history and text of laws must be supplemented by a scientific treatment of their reason and connection. In Philosophy, a full and coherent synthesis of scholastic philosophy following the method and principles of St. Thomas should form the basis for a criticism of other systems. Rules for the five Roman Institutes follow (art. 29-30).

A degree course will extend over five years in a Theological Faculty, four years in Philosophy, three years in Canon Law. The Biblical Institute and the Institutes of Oriental Studies and Christian Archaeology will require three years, the Institute of Ecclesiastical and Civil Law four. There are three Sections in the Institute of Sacred Music. The course in Gregorian Chant covers three years, the Organ four, Composition five. Besides the principal and auxiliary subjects, one or two special subjects or courses in questions of greater moment should be included in the syllabus of each Faculty, and successful examinations in the special subjects are essential to the validity of academic degrees (art. 31-33).

iv. Grant of Degrees.

With the single exception of the Biblical Commission, no academy, college or institute which does not teach, can confer degrees. Permission to grant an honorary degree must be asked for anew each time the occasion arises.

The Baccalaureate may not be conferred before the end of the second year in Theology, Philosophy or Ecclesiastical and Civil Law; before the end of the first year in Canon Law, Sacred Scripture, Oriental Studies or Christian Archaeology; or before the end of the first year in Chant, the second in the Organ, the third in Composition.

The Licentiate may not be conferred before the close of the year preceding the final year in each Faculty. It will be granted, therefore, at the end of the fourth year in Theology, the third in Philosophy or Law (both branches), the second

in Canon Law, and in the Biblical, Oriental or Archæological Institute, the second in Plainsong, the third in the Organ, the fourth in Composition.

The earliest date at which the Doctorate may be granted is the end of the fifth year in Theology, the fourth in Philosophy and in Ecclesiastical and Civil Law, the third in Canon Law, Oriental Studies and Sacred Archæology, the third in Gregorian Chant, the fourth in the Organ, the fifth in Composition, and the second after the Licentiate in Sacred Scripture.

For the Doctorate a candidate must also present a written dissertation, which should be a distinct contribution to knowledge. It should, in part at least, be printed. The candidate must defend the dissertation publicly before the academic Authorities and Professors. Some further public test should also be added (art. 35-46).

v. *Material Equipment.*

A brief section calls attention to the need of suitable lecture-rooms, libraries, laboratories and so forth, and concludes by recommending competent honoraria, suitable pensions for continued service, and the fixing of students' fees for admission, yearly attendance, examinations and diplomas (art. 47-52).

vi. *Temporary Regulations.*

The new Constitution comes into full force on the first day of the academic year 1932-1933. Previous studies and examinations will still be considered valid. Post-graduate courses already established may be continued for the present, but should be made to conform as far as possible to the new scheme.

Revised statutes must be submitted to the Sacred Congregation before June 30th, 1932, along with a scholastic and financial statement covering the past three years. Neglect to carry out this provision will involve deprivation of the right to grant degrees.

Contrary laws or customs, whether of a universal or of a particular character, are abrogated, including even those which are *specialissima et individua mentione dignæ*. All contrary privileges hitherto granted are revoked (art. 53-58).

ORDINANCES OF THE S.C. OF SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Regulations issued by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities explain how the new Constitution is to be applied, and in what sense its clauses must be understood. From the forty-nine explanatory Articles it will be sufficient here to single out those which have a more immediate interest for our own seminaries.

The previous course of classical studies must include Religious Instruction, Latin, Greek and one's own Language and Literature as principal subjects; and Natural History, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Geography and Civil History as secondary.

If any of these subjects has been omitted or insufficiently treated, the candidate must make up the deficiency and pass an examination in such manner as the statutes will define (art. 13-15).

A student who has completed his two years of Philosophy elsewhere than in a school approved by ecclesiastical authority for the teaching of Scholastic Philosophy, will not be admitted to a degree course of Theology except after studying Scholastic Philosophy for at least one year in an approved school, and giving satisfaction in an examination in all parts of Scholastic Philosophy (art. 16).

In all Universities and Faculties, the following subjects must be taught in Latin: Sacred Scripture, Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Scholastic Philosophy, the Code of Canon Law, Roman Law (art. 21).

If any student has completed his classical course and also an ordinary two-year course of Philosophy and four-year course of Theology, as required by the new Constitution and the Code of Canon Law, he may be admitted to the fourth year of a degree course in Theology after a preliminary examination (art. 26).

Those who have completed their four years of Theology elsewhere than in a Theological Faculty canonically erected and approved, will be admitted to a degree course in Canon Law after an examination in the *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*; no student, however, who has not completed four years in Theology, will be admitted to such a course unless he first pass an examination in the principles of Moral Theology, Natural Law and Fundamental Theology and in the *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*. The examination is obligatory not only for clerics, but also for laymen who have taken their doctorate in civil law, and who are, therefore, allowed to complete a degree course in Canon Law in two years (*ibid.*)

Candidates who, after the prescribed course of classical studies, have finished a two-year course of Scholastic Philosophy in a school approved by ecclesiastical authority, may be admitted after an examination into the third year of a degree course in Philosophy; those who have completed their two years' Philosophy elsewhere, may take the degree course in three years instead of the usual four (*ibid.*).

Eight lists of principal and auxiliary subjects, required in the several Faculties, are printed in full. The special subjects or courses are to be determined by the peculiar traditions of each University and by local or national requirements (art. 27).

There are three appendices. The first suggests various classes of "special" subjects; the second and third describe the method to be pursued in drawing up the statutes and in framing the triennial reports to the Sacred Congregation.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Nature of Belief. By the Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Sheed & Ward 7s. 6d.)

This is an important book. Moreover it is most timely. A word of warning to the prospective reader may not be out of place. Unless he be ready for some pretty hard mental work and some severe concentration, he had better leave this book alone. But if he is equal to the necessary effort and keeps it up to the end, his reward will be great.

After an introductory examination of the "present condition of belief" Fr. D'Arcy proceeds (Chapters II and III) to a vindication of the mind as an immaterial faculty capable of knowing reality and attaining to truth, and then goes on to analyse the nature of belief, to show that it can result in certainty, to expound the relations between the intellect and the will in the quest for truth, and to show how the psychology of the subconscious, while providing a valuable hypothesis, and much new material for investigation, fails as an explanation of the way in which we are led to certain knowledge. There follows a lengthy analysis of Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, which Fr. D'Arcy regards as "an enduring masterpiece that has not received the attention it deserves," a work which, by its insight and conformity with experience, almost compels agreement with its conclusions even though one is forced to dissent from the verbal framework in which the thought is set.

Two chapters are then given to a criticism of the *Grammar*. Of these the second is by far the more important, its subject being Newman's "illative sense." This Fr. D'Arcy cannot accept. He objects to its being called a "sense" and contends, in effect, that Newman mistook a process for a power. To this process, which he calls "interpretation," Fr. D'Arcy allows an even wider field than did Newman to the activity of the illative sense, but practically the difference between them is mainly one of terminology. The writer's vindication of this process of interpretation, with his exposition of its efficacy as a means to certainty, and of the parts played by the "pattern" of the mind and of what he calls the unity of indirect reference, is masterly, both in its lucidity and in its patient piecing together of all the elements of the complex argument. The way is now open for a discussion of belief, in the sense of faith. Naturally the reasonableness of faith upon human authority is the subject of a chapter, and then we have a lengthy discussion and criticism of religious experience as the foundation and motive of faith in God. This is a thing that badly needed doing, and Fr. D'Arcy has done it well. This chapter shows

clearly the strength of the traditional Catholic position, and, incidentally, exposes the rather pitiful incompetence of many present-day writers who have ventured light-heartedly and (I am tempted to add since Fr. D'Arcy is too polite to do so) empty-headedly, into regions where only the trained and well-equipped thinker should dare.

Finally, after defining the limits of belief, our author deals with divine faith. As he points out, he does not mean to argue the case for Christianity, but to show that divine faith is but another, the highest, instance of interpretation, and "the curtain-raiser of the final and divine interpretation of life."

To find a place for all the necessary conditions of an act of divine faith is not easy. It must be free, certain, reasonable and supernatural. Fr. D'Arcy, naming no names, shows how some theologians tend to exalt its freedom at the expense of its reasonableness, while others, in the emphasis upon its supernatural character, are apt to compromise its freedom. The delicate adjustment of the various elements has engaged theologians for centuries. Fr. D'Arcy will, therefore, hardly hope that his solution of the problem will be accepted as final. But all, I think, will admit the clearness of his statement, and allow that his book brings us definitely nearer to a satisfactory settlement of a question that is as difficult as it is interesting.

B. V. MILLER.

Maria Hominum Coredemptria. By P. Herminius Borzi, C.S.S.R. (Beyaert, Bruges; Marietti, Rome and Turin. 1931.)

In the development of Christian dogma heresy has the providential rôle of occasioning on the part of the faithful—and sometimes on the part of the *Ecclesia docens* herself—a reiterated, emphatic and more explicit declaration of Catholic truth. In this sense, too, "abyss calls to abyss": when error raises its voice it finds in the Church no other echo save a firmer assertion of the teaching of Christ. And yet—I ask the question, lest by statement I lay myself open to contradiction—has the Protestant repudiation of Mary in this country led English Catholics to be especially outspoken in vindicating her privileges? Or have we not heard another and quite different principle invoked, to the effect that "we must be careful what we say, lest our non-Catholic neighbours misunderstand us"? The danger of being misunderstood may well cause us to be exact in our statements, to avoid frenzied exaggerations, but it hardly justifies an excessive reticence. The teaching of the Church concerning the part which Mary plays in our Redemption is a case in point. Let us by all means abhor those extravagant sentiments which to Newman seemed "like a bad dream"; distortions of the truth, they do honour neither to God nor to His holy Mother. Nevertheless, that Mary is not only the Mother of God, not only the Mother

of the Redeemer, but that, moreover, by the will of her divine Son she has been associated with Him in His salutary work of Redemption, that in the restoration of the human race Mary takes a part analogous to that which Eve played in bringing about the Fall, these are truths which belong to the precious heritage of Catholic Tradition. Let us then without fear announce them from the house-tops.

Mary is herself redeemed; in fact she is the masterpiece of the Redemption. Therefore her co-operation in the work of her Son is secondary and essentially subordinate. Her merits, the power of her intercession, the very consent which she freely gave to the divine command that she should be the Mother of God, all derive their value and their efficacy from the infinite merits of the "one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." God has willed to make men His helpers, His "co-adjutors" in the work of the sanctification of mankind, and to His Mother (how could it be otherwise?) he has reserved the office of co-operating therein in a unique and universal manner.

When once this has been understood, we need have no hesitation in according to Mary her rightful title of "Co-Redemptrix," in speaking of her universal mediation, in affirming that all graces come to us by Mary. The exact meaning and bearing of these and similar propositions have formed the subject of numerous works published during the past two decades, and the elucidation of such points represents no mean contribution to recent theological development. Fr. Borzi's work, though small in bulk, need not fear comparison with any which have hitherto appeared on the same theme. With a devotion to our Lady typical of the Congregation to which he belongs, the author combines the accuracy of expression and sobriety of language characteristic of the theologian. The integral place which Mary occupies in the divine decree of Redemption, her active co-operation with Christ in carrying it out, her part in the distribution of the fruits of the Redemption, all this is clearly explained, and supported by a wealth of scriptural, patristic and theological authorities. While nothing could be more precise than the author's explanation of Mary's influence in the distribution of grace, I must confess to a feeling of regret that Fr. Borzi fails to stress sufficiently—if, indeed, he at all mentions—the fact that the universal mediation of Mary must not be misunderstood to mean that we receive no grace except by actual recourse to her all-powerful intercession. The removal of this misconception would serve to open many minds to a proper appreciation of all that is involved in the title "Mother of divine grace."

In conclusion let it not seem ungracious to lament that so excellent a work should be marred, however superficially, by frequent misprints and—to say the least—unusual Latin constructions.

GEORGE D. SMITH.

The Unrealists: William James, Bertrand Russell, Einstein, etc.
By Hervey Wickham. pp. xi. and 264. London: Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

In *The Unrealists* Mr. F. J. Sheed introduces Hervey Wickham to English readers. He explains that Mr. Wickham (1870-1930) was not a Catholic and not a formal scholastic. He was an extraordinarily acute thinker, who expressed himself with a vividness and raciness of style, that might lead the casual reader, Mr. Sheed fears, to dismiss him as superficial. Surely no such fear is founded, as it is quite impossible to read Mr. Wickham without feeling that the man desired supremely to get at the naked truth. And why should philosophy, and the pursuit of wisdom be associated with long words, longer sentences, and a style that is not only pompous but definitely "pomptious"? Has not truth down the ages been spoken by those, who could express themselves with abundance of humour, and in joyous alertness?

Here, then, are papers well worth reading, for the author is always wise and never ponderous. He discusses William James, the raciest of philosophers, Bergson, Santayana, Einstein, Russell, John Dewey, Alexander, Whitehead. About them all he has refreshing, delightful things to say, and in saying them, presses home his sane criticisms.

We give but two small instances. A propos Bergson. When everything seemed static: "'Everything moves forward,' cried Bergson, 'in effect.' . . . It was almost as if a fresh sea-breeze had suddenly blown . . . Almost, but not quite. For if everything moves, then motion becomes Absolutely Immanent and—as is the habit of such Absolutes—ceases to move. A thing cannot move except in relation to something which is relatively at rest. A breeze can't blow across a desert, if it takes the desert with it . . ."

A propos Einstein, which is a good paper, he writes: "Again it was in German, and not in Mathematics, that he described the universe as 'finite but unbounded.' 'We may imagine,' he declares, 'an existence in two-dimensioned space. Flat beings . . . free to move in a plane . . . ' This, of course, is a flat falsehood. We can imagine no such creatures, nor would they be free to move if we could . . ."

It is difficult to quote the better things for they would need too long an introduction, if not printed textually.

This book may therefore be commended for much combined lightness and sureness of touch. It will interest everyone who is interested in philosophy, and many readers may be amused to notice—for it is an unusual experience—how much they learn whilst enjoying themselves. One little word to the publishers. Isn't the apple-green cover with the gentian-blue lettering rather staring and restless? And are not the photographic reproductions lamentable?

JOHN G. VANCE.

In Defence of Purity. By Dietrich von Hilderbrand. (Sheed & Ward. 196 pages. 6s.)

The reader will not find in this book as he will in the preceding ones anything about sex-instruction, or rules of conduct, or even apologetics against the modern attacks on celibacy. In fact, we do not think *In Defence of Purity* a good title for the contents of the book. It is an analysis rather than a defence, but one so profound and enlightening, that it cannot fail to be valuable to all who have opportunity of reading it. Its theme is the unfolding of the greatest of all the virtues, love, as it shows itself not only in consecrated virginity, married life and celibacy, but also as the fundamental explanation of the Divine provision, sex life and instinct.

We are so accustomed to loathe and fly from the abuse of the life function, that we become, many of us, obsessed with the prejudice that it is something vile in itself. We shall arise from the study of this work disabused of all this. We shall see that married life in its true ideals and purpose is nobler than the abstinence of many who lead the single life. "Beware, too," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "when thou art zealous for continence, that thou be not puffed up against those who are married, for they too are pure."

We shall discover, many of us for the first time, the full and true reason why the consecrated virgin is the bride of Christ, and the secret of the Divine wedlock of Christ and His consecrated spouses. All who would wish to know the intrinsic beauty of purity and how it can be found in all states of life, as a reflection of the Divine love,—for as St. John defines: "God is love,"—will get this book.

A. H. VILLIERS.

Catholic Sex Morality. Dr. Rudolf Geiss. (Wagner & Herder. 104 pages. 5s.)

This little book is by a Director of the Archiepiscopal Seminary of Freiburg, and has all the scholarship and completeness one looks for in a German Catholic Professor. It treats rather of sex morality than of instruction, though it has a chapter headed "Education and Sex," but addressed to married and single alike. The aim of the work is to show that Catholic ethics alone can protect and preserve from aberration the sex instinct, and the author combats the false sympathy which builds up sex ethics on human weakness; as also that misconception of Catholic teaching which accuses the Church of regarding the instinct as in itself sinful, and sex relationships as void of all spiritual and æsthetical qualities. Whereas it is the Church alone which gives to these qualities their proper value and emphasis.

He approaches his subject from a metaphysical and ethical point of view, and trusts more to reasoned conclusions than to authorities. We know of no book which brings out more

clearly what is noble and beautiful in the Divine institution of Holy Matrimony, and the justification of the high rank to which St. Paul and after him the Church at all times has lifted up the married state. Procreation is, no doubt, the primary end of matrimony, but it has others which though variable and conditioned are real and true. But these secondary purposes only ripen to those who have mastered the art, and it is an art, by which matrimony is divested of coarseness and selfishness, and is clothed with the glamour of tenderness and beauty, which begets homes of love and Christian joy and that union of soul, which likens earthly unions to that of Christ and His Church.

No one can read this treatise without acquiring a higher ideal of the Divine provision for the handing on of life, and a deeper appreciation of the possibilities of noble and elevating life which a Christian union affords. The upbuilding of a Christian home and the creation of spiritual harmony between two souls are objects worthy of the best of human energies.

The author treats of the biological and spiritual sides of sex life, and the ethics which govern them; as also the value, road to, and preservation of chastity in and out of the married state.

Many will find the author's style somewhat difficult to follow, but all will find it beautiful in thought and conception, and of a literary charm which is rare in philosophical and ethical treatises. Only a trained mind will take in all his reasonings and inferences, but no one will fail to see that the Catholic ideals set out are noble and beautiful and their basis divine. Though there is nothing which is not treated seriously and modestly in the whole of the book, there are passages in the biological chapters which might very well have been left out.

A. H. VILLIERS.

Sex Instruction. By J. J. Walsh, M.D. (Wagner & Herder. 220 pages. 8s.)

This subject has dangers all its own, and both the Holy Father in his later Encyclical on Christian Education of Youth and the Holy Office in a Decree issued March of this year, have condemned strongly certain proposed methods of sex instruction which even Catholics, led astray by non-Catholic writers and appalled at the increase of youthful immorality, have not hesitated to advocate in the Press and on the platform. Dr. Walsh's book, however, does not fall under either of these strictures.

In treating this subject three things have to be kept in mind. First: the weapons with which the Church has always combatted these evils are not in the armoury of those outside. They have not our sacramental system and its attendant graces. Neither have their children before them the vision of "the pure uplifted hands" of the Virgin Mother, nor of the many virgin

saints of the calendar. Nor again have they the living example of our many religious communities and of a celibate clergy, keeping before the minds of adolescents the nobility and the possibility of purity of life and thought. We take our children in their tender years and we teach them, "the clean of heart shall see God." We train them up to love what is modest and pure without opening up to their knowledge the avenues of vice.

Second: knowledge is not necessarily protective, it may be and often is provocative of evil. Certainly it will be this last, if the will is not strengthened, and discipline and self-control practised. The Church has not waited for the twentieth century to know the evils of uncontrolled sex impulses, or how best to combat them. She has nothing to learn from non-Catholics in this matter, neither from medical men nor from social workers.

Third: knowledge is necessary both for the protection of the adolescent against libertines and sex maniacs, and the maintenance of a clean life amid the lures of modern society. But, as the late Encyclical on Education points out, all such instruction must be individual not collective, at a time the most opportune, by those who have the grace needed for the work, and it must be preceded by those adequate precautions which Christian tradition has always considered necessary. For unless the child has been trained to love purity, to rely upon the sacraments, and has been kept from the occasions of sin, knowledge of the mysteries of life will nourish a desire for information more complete and experimental.

These fundamental and traditional principles, set forth in the Encyclical and the decree of the Holy Office, Dr. Walsh in his book here reviewed has had before him and has emphasized on every page. Though only one chapter is devoted directly to sex instruction "When, What and How," the book is crammed with sound advice on the matter, and exposes very fully the modern dangers and incentives to moral corruption. Modern dances, sex literature, the lessons of the "movies," the cry "back to nature" now so loudly and openly heard, as also the abuses and dangers of psycho-analysis are all treated of and warned against.

Dr. Walsh writes in a fluent and attractive style, free from technicalities and easy to follow. Though many of the dangers he warns against are peculiar to America, all readers, clerical and lay, teachers and parents, will find this book full of useful information, at once sound in doctrine and practical.

A. H. VILLIERS.

Liturgische Volksbuchlein. (Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder.)

This is a title of a series of popular liturgical booklets, which vary in price from sixpence to threepence, dealing with the sacraments and the sacramentals of the Church. They are

edited by the Benedictine monks of the Abbey of Maria Laach, and are, as one would naturally expect, models of their kind. Each booklet on the sacraments begins with a brief introduction dealing with high matters of dogma and liturgy in the simplest and most attractive way. The text of the Ritual (or Pontifical) is translated and the symbolism of the rite explained in a few clear sentences. Marriage is beautifully treated of in the liturgy that concerns *Mutter und Kind*. The burial service (*Das Begräbnis*) is shown to be a source of strength and consolation at the breast of our Mother the Church. The Blessing at Meals (*Das Christliche Mahl*) the Christian idea of home and the need of God's guidance to the traveller (*Auf den Weg des Friedens*) show how one's day may be sanctified. The Church's liturgy bears on every circumstance of life, and pamphlets like these bring the liturgy to our hearts and homes and quicken the spirit of Christ amongst us.

M. S. MACMAHON.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

NOVA ET VETERA: Revue Catholique pour la Suisse Romande publishes a very strong September number (Quarterly, Fragnière Frères. Fribourg. Switzerland. 9 Swiss francs a year). Dom Gajard of Solesmes has a remarkable article on *Musique Grégorienne*. He begins by emphasizing its fundamentally religious character as an act of religion, of public worship, inseparably bound up with the Liturgy of the Church. In fact, it is *the chanted prayer of the Church*—the fully formulated, authoritative, adequate prayer of the Church: "Je crois que ce n'est ni dans le seul Bréviaire, ni dans le seul Missel qu'il faut chercher la prière de l'Eglise; elle y est certes, mais incomplète sans son accent, Ce n'est que dans l'Antiphonaire et dans le Graduel qu'elle trouve son expression pleine parfaite, authentique, adéquate. Ces prières là ont été faites pour être chantées: primitivement et dans tout le Moyen âge elles l'étaient toujours; (la messe basse était inconnue, comme la récitation isolée de l'office—une anomalie) et même elles étaient réservées au choeur seul; le Pontife ne les disait pas à l'Autel.

"Ce n'était que par le chant que le peuple intervenait pratiquement dans la liturgie." (p. 210.) The writer then proceeds to a careful study of the comparative technical merits of Gregorian melody and the modern musical system. Fr. Lavaud, O.P., gives us a solid and useful piece of work in *La Mystique dans le mouvement Catholique contemporain*. He makes clear what exactly is meant by the Mystical Life and Mystical Doctrine. That mystical doctrine has long been formulated. Its classical sources are being utilized to-day by writers who condense and summarize their teaching from some personal point of view and then bring it to the bar of the empirical sciences. It has thus become necessary to develop what may be termed apologetical mystical theology. At the other extreme the activities of pseudo-mystics have led the Church to condemn their errors, with the result that an anti-mystical reaction dominated many minds and led to unjustifiable conclusions which our own day is setting right. Fr. Lavaud then sets out the recent past and the present condition of mystical studies in the Church. The study of the actual condition is reserved to a future article. The exposition of the work of the recent past aims at showing what has been done to check the advance of naturalistic writers who seek to reduce to their own level and judge by their own natural standards Christian Mysticism and the experience of the Saints. Not a few of their works are analyzed and criticized. The writer then goes on to show how Catholic scholars and theologians have established the rights of Theology and shown that the Mystical life, being the effect proper of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, cannot be brought within the sphere of ordinary psychology and cannot be reduced

ultimately to anything but itself. In developing this section the place of honour is assigned to M. Jacques Maritain, and Pères Gardail and Garrigou-Lagrange.

Charles Journet writes some useful *Notes sur le Décalogue, Calvin, les Images*, showing the historical basis of the different numeration of the Commandments current in Catholic books and in Non-Catholic books in England and Switzerland. The problem of the numbering is an old one: there is Talmudic solution accepted by most Jews, though not by all. Philo of Alexandria and Josephus had their solution which was adopted by Origen. Calvin adopted it as also did the English Reformers. The traditional Catholic numeration derives from St. Augustine.

Charles Soumet also has a very good article on *L'argument du Martyre*, in which he faces quite loyally the difficulty presented by historical fact of Protestant Martyrs and the value of this testimony.

In the July ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW John A. Ryan has condensed *The New Things in the New Encyclical* on reconstructing the Social Order. John A. O'Brien, writing on *Holiness through our Pastoral Ministry*, strikes a new note in ascetics. *Sanctity consists simply in doing the will of God.* "What is the will of God in regard to the pastoral clergy? It is that we should perform the mission divinely appointed unto us . . . to preach the gospel to every creature, to baptize, to call sinners to repentance, to anoint the sick, to nourish souls with the divine food of the Holy Eucharist. . . . Our sanctity is inseparably bound up with the faithful discharge of the duties of our priestly ministry. Our sanctification is to be achieved principally through our own work. In fact it might be said that it is to be achieved only through our work, in the sense that if we fail to do our work as well as we can, then no other means of sanctification will avail. The more faithfully and zealously we do our work each day, the greater is our holiness. . . . The work of our ministry is one of the highest forms of prayer. . . . We can't be on our knees all day, but we can offer up our whole day's work as fragrant incense of praise and adoration before the throne of God."

"In stressing the zealous discharge of the manifold duties of the pastoral ministry as a means of acquiring sanctity there is no intention of minimizing the importance of prayer, meditation and other spiritual exercises. Indeed, these are of supreme importance. They purify the intention, kindle zeal, supply a stamina that is indispensable for the discharge, day in and day out, of all the varied tasks of the Shepherd of souls. Lacking the right intention, no amount of external work or achievement produces sanctity. All spiritual writers emphasize this. . . . The purpose is rather to focus the attention upon the zealous discharge of the divinely-appointed duties of the pastoral ministry, assuming always prayer and meditation as among them, as the primary means of sanctification for the

shepherd of souls. This interpretation helps to remove the concept of sanctity from the nebulous mists of mysticism which have so long enshrouded it, identifying it in the minds of many, lay and clerical alike, with the transcendental experiences of the anchorite or the contemplative mystic."

Mgr. James A. Ryan, writing on *The Catholic University of America: focus of National Catholic Influence*, urges a strong plea for the endowment of Catholic Scholarship in America.

Mixed Marriages: a Recent Study is a useful summary of Fr. Ter Haar's *De Matrimonii Mixtis Eorumque Remediis*. It is well that we should grasp the ravages for which Mixed Marriages are responsible throughout the world. The data and the conclusions presented deserve the serious attention of all engaged in the care of souls, as also does his plea for a more vigorous opposition to mixed marriages.

The September BLACKFRIARS has an article by Fr. Dominic Devas, O.F.M., *Light—or otherwise—on "the Leakage,"* based upon experience gathered when giving Missions. He raises the question whether the "Leakage" is larger than we ought to expect—given our large increase in numbers and the disintegration of Christian principles in the vast majority of our countrymen in the midst of whom we must live. The problem is no new one. There are circumstances which render the practice of religion well nigh impossible, and tend in all but strong souls, tempered to sacrifice, necessarily to weaken faith. Often a man cannot come to Mass, because of the hours of his work, then ultimately he will not want to come, even when he can. "To my own mind the root cause is seldom malice or ignorance; it is simply this: the Faith, known adequately, no matter by what method, is not loved enough for its own sake to make it override other claims." The suggestion, then, is that devotion to the Faith, an intense love of the Faith, is a more effective remedy for the "leakage" than any intellectual grasp of it, over and above what is demanded of every Catholic if he would give "reason for the faith that is in him." "You appear," [the objector] would say "to discourage intellectual equipment as the great weapon; you evidently do not see in Boys' Clubs and After-Care work an adequate solution, you talk of lateral advance without telling us in what, you demand love of the Faith, as though it were not obvious that what is loved is never lost without a struggle, but you have not helped us on one bit by any practical contribution, and there is no sign of your promised remedy." "I admit the charge . . . it is not easy to express—nor wise perhaps—what I have in my mind. *Intensify our spiritual life all round*, is the pale platitude it resolves itself into" (p. 544). "To demand more and not less of her children and ministers is the wisest thing for the Church in the end. The minimum may serve theologically, but it is not enough to win love" (p. 546).

The ETUDES for August 5th contains a well-documented study by Père Paul Doncoeur on *Les Paroisses de France: enquête sur le Clergé paroissial Français de 1900 à 1930*. It is at once sad and glorious reading: sad in the falling off in the number of ordinations, glorious in the effort made under the most trying condition to remedy the loss.

Much has been written in praise and dispraise of *George Bernard Shaw*, but G. K. Chesterton's critical analysis of his work and character in the August number of THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW should not be overlooked by the admirers of either writer.

ETUDES FRANCISCAINES for September publishes a remarkable article by Abbé Bremond: *La Communion fréquente au XVII^e siècle* in which he shows that, contrary to the current opinion, the seventeenth century in France was a great Eucharistic century and that the alleged long Eucharistic eclipse due to Jansenistic influence is merely an odious legend.

CORRESPONDENCE

MARRIAGE BEFORE A PROTESTANT MINISTER.

Is it a correct interpretation of Can. 2319 §1.1. to hold that the censure of excommunication is not incurred by two Catholics marrying before a Protestant minister, but is incurred only by the Catholic party in a mixed marriage thus celebrated?

Canon 2319, §1, 1 "Subsunt excommunicationi latae sententiae Ordinario reservatae catholici qui matrimonium ineunt coram ministro acatholico contra praescriptum Can. 1063, §1."

Can. 1063 forbids the appearance before a Protestant minister, in his religious capacity, even though a dispensation from the Impediment of Mixed Religion has previously been obtained, and even though the marriage has already been contracted in the Catholic Church. It occurs in the section of the Code which is concerned exclusively with *Mixed Religion*. On the principle that an onerous law must be interpreted strictly and "Non licet poenam de persona ad personam vel de casu ad casum producere, quamvis par adsit ratio, imo gravior, . . ." (Can. 2219, §3), it is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that this censure applies only to a mixed marriage, and this is Cappello's interpretation (*De Censuris*, §369). The position of two Catholics marrying in a Protestant Church is that they are invalidly married, unless the Catholic marriage preceded the one before the Protestant minister. They are also *suspecti de heresi* (Can. 2316) and are to be considered as heretics, and therefore excommunicated after a period of six months unless they remove this suspicion by repentance (Can. 2315).

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

ly
ur
nd
of
ng

ge
is
LI
er

ole
ii"
n,
tic
to

of
ant
hus

iae
am

er,
he
nd
he
is
ple
cet
re,
it
are
er-
ics
illy
ore
an.
ore
ove
